

Library of

Wellesley



College.

Presented by Mr. A. A. Sweet

No 45484

THE EXPOSITOR.

VOL. X.

List of Contributors to Volume X.

- REV. W. C. ALLEN, M.A.
PETER BAYNE, LL.D.
REV. PROF. JOSEPH AGAR BEET, D.D.
REV. PROF. A. B. BRUCE, D.D.
REV. PROF. T. K. CHEYNE, D.D.
F. C. CONYBEARE, M.A.
REV. JOHN A. CROSS, M.A.
REV. T. HERBERT DARLOW, M.A.
SIR J. WILLIAM DAWSON, C.M.G., F.R.S.
REV. JAMES DENNEY, D.D.
REV. PROF. MARCUS DODS, D.D.
VEN. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S.
REV. E. H. GIFFORD, D.D.
G. BUCHANAN GRAY, M.A.
REV. PROF. ANDREW HARPER, B.D.
BENJAMIN KIDD.
REV. PROF. THOMAS M. LINDSAY, D.D.
REV. PROF. J. RAWSON LUMBY, D.D.
PROF. EBERHARD NESTLE, PH.D.
REV. PROF. A. ROBERTS, D.D.
REV. P. CARNEGIE SIMPSON, M.A.
REV. PROF. GEORGE ADAM SMITH, D.D.
REV. JAMES STALKER, D.D.
REV. JOHN WATSON, M.A.
REV. PREBENDARY WHITEFOORD, M.A.
PROF. A. S. WILKINS, LL.D.

THE
EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

FOURTH SERIES.

Volume X.

London:
HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

—
MDCCCXCIV.

4543 +

BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS,
FROME, AND LONDON.

B5
410
E1
X.4

THE CHURCHES OF GALATIA.

NOTES ON A RECENT CONTROVERSY.

PROFESSOR W. M. RAMSAY'S very interesting and important work on *The Church in the Roman Empire* has thrown much new light upon the record of St. Paul's missionary journeys in Asia Minor, and has revived a question which of late years had seemingly been set at rest for English students by the late Bishop Lightfoot's Essay on "The Churches of Galatia" in the Introduction to his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*.

The question, as there stated (p. 17), is whether the Churches mentioned in *Galatians* i. 2 are to be placed in "the comparatively small district occupied by the Gauls, Galatia properly so called, or the much larger territory included in the Roman province of that name."

Dr. Lightfoot, with admirable fairness, first points out in a very striking passage some of the "considerations in favour of the Roman province." "The term 'Galatia,'" he says, "in that case will comprise not only the towns of Derbe and Lystra, but also, it would seem, Iconium and the Pisidian Antioch; and we shall then have in the narrative of St. Luke (Acts xiii. 14-xiv. 24) a full and detailed account of the founding of the Galatian Churches." . . . "It must be confessed, too, that this view has much to recommend it at first sight. The Apostle's account of his hearty and enthusiastic welcome by the Galatians as an angel of God (iv. 14), would have its counterpart in the impulsive warmth of the barbarians at Lystra, who would have sacrificed to him, imagining that 'the gods had come down in

the likeness of men' (Acts xiv. 11). His references to 'the temptation in the flesh,' and 'the marks of the Lord Jesus' branded on his body (Gal. iv. 14; vi. 17), are then illustrated, or thought to be illustrated, by the persecutions and sufferings that 'came unto him at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra' (2 Tim. iii. 11). The progress of Judaizing tendencies among the Galatians is then accounted for by the presence of a large Jewish element such as the history describes in those Churches of Lycaonia and Pisidia."

Bishop Lightfoot does not himself accept this view, but proceeds to argue with his usual ability that the Churches addressed in the Epistle were to be found in the chief cities of North Galatia, Ancyra, Pessinus, Tavium, and perhaps Juliopolis or Gordium.

Professor Ramsay, whose work is founded on his own travels and explorations, adopts the former, or, as he conveniently names it, "the South Galatian theory."

This part of his work has been criticised in THE EXPOSITOR, December, 1893, by the Rev. F. H. Chase, Principal of the Cambridge Clergy Training School. The criticism has given rise to a discussion in several numbers of THE EXPOSITOR for the present year. Unfortunately, the Professor and his Critic are still at issue on various points of more or less interest, and especially on the main question, What was the locality of "the Churches of Galatia?" This being a matter of the greatest importance to a right understanding of the personal history and work of the great Apostle, and to the determination of the order, date, and true interpretation of his earlier epistles, I have been encouraged by the known wishes of several learned friends to try to clear up some of the points now left in dispute, and to ascertain, as far as I may be able, which of the rival theories is the better entitled to our acceptance.

I. The first point on which Professor Ramsay and his Critic are at issue is the connexion between the clauses *ai*

μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησῖαι ἐστερεοῦντο . . . (v. 5) and διήλθον δὲ . . . (v. 6).

Mr. Chase states the connexion as follows (THE EXPOSITOR, December, 1893, p. 408) :—

“In xvi. 1-4 St. Luke tells us definitely of St. Paul’s visit to Derbe and Lystra, and by the use of the phrase τὰς πόλεις, v. 4, seems to imply that St. Paul visited the other chief cities of the district. He next records the *sequel*, which he introduces by the particle οὖν. . . . This *sequel* has two parts, which St. Luke clearly marks off by the use of μὲν (v. 5) and δέ (v. 6).”

Mr. Chase evidently regards the whole passage vv. 1-8 as *one continuous narrative proceeding entirely and originally from the same author*; and from this, which has been the usual point of view, his statement of the connexion of the passage is strictly in accordance with the general use of the distributive particles μὲν and δέ.

On the other hand, Professor Ramsay regards this as one of the passages which prove that “the account given in Acts of St. Paul’s journeys, is founded on, or perhaps actually incorporates, an account written down under the immediate influence of Paul himself.”

The same view is taken by Wendt, in his revised edition of Meyer’s *Commentary*. Verses 4, 5, he says, stand out conspicuously as an insertion by St. Luke in the summary Travel-document, which is resumed in xvi. 6 ff.¹ “The writer,” says Professor Ramsay, “retains the precise words of his authority in xvi. 6, 7, and this authority was a document written, whether by himself at an earlier time or by some other person, under the immediate influence of St. Paul himself.”

¹ A similar view is approved by Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ*, The Epistle to the Galatians, No. x. note. He thinks it highly probable “that there is in this place a dislocation of the text, and that the fourth and fifth verses of the sixteenth chapter ought to follow the last verse of the fifteenth. . . . And then the sixteenth chapter takes up a new and unbroken paragraph.”

On this view of the passage the δέ in xvi. 6 is one of "the precise words" of the Travel-document, and as such is naturally regarded by Professor Ramsay as having no reference to μέν in v. 5. This he explains by the remark that in the double particle μέν οὖν "the μέν has no relation whatever to a following δέ, but coheres and is merged in the unified compound μενοῦν."

I do not find that Professor Ramsay has quoted any examples in which either μέν οὖν or μενοῦν is so used that "the μέν has no relation whatever to a following δέ." It is however a matter on which grammarians are not altogether agreed. Dr. Donaldson, *Greek Grammar*, § 567, says: "When μέν stands by itself, without any corresponding δέ, the latter, or some equivalent, is virtually implied, and μέν looks forward to the completion of the sentence, just as οὖν looks back to what has been already said. Thus when Socrates is going to catechize Meno's slave, he asks the master, Ἐλλην μὲν ἐστὶ καὶ ἐλληνίζει; "He is a Greek, I suppose, and talks Greek?" (Plato, *Meno*, 82B). Here an εἰ δὲ μή is obviously implied: "if he is not, he will not serve my purpose of questioning him."

This is particularly obvious in the combination, μέν οὖν. Thus in the answer, πάντῃ μὲν οὖν, which is so common in the Platonic dialogues, there is a manifest suspension of part of the sentence: "You are right as to what you say, but what follows?" (τί δ' ἔπειτα;)"¹

Other grammarians for the most part take the same view. Thus Hermann, on Viger, *de Idiotismis Græcis*, p. 839, says: "Μέν si dicitur non sequente δέ, aut intelligi potest δέ, aut omittitur illa pars orationis in qua sequi debebat δέ."

So A. Buttmann, in his *Grammar of the New Testament Dialect*, p. 312, observes that "Every sentence with μέν, not followed by any corresponding δέ, is properly always to

¹ For other instances of this use of μέν in questions, see Plat., *Charmid.*, § 2, *Eur., Med.*, 676, 1129; *Alc.*, 146; *Hipp.*, 316, etc.

be considered as an Anacoluthon ” ; on p. 317 he adds that *οὖν* is often melted into one particle with *μέν*. “ With this *μέν οὖν* transitions are often made to what follows; and even when *δέ* follows, it by no means always stands in a responsive relation to the preceding, but simply carries forward the narrative.” . . . “ In this genuinely classical manner Luke often uses *μέν οὖν*, especially in Acts.”

On our present passage Dr. Bernard Weiss, in his recent edition of *Acts*, in Harnack's *Studien*, vol. ix., says that “ *μέν οὖν* adds yet another supplementary remark on the result of this progress through the cities (*v.* 4), corresponding to ‘ confirming the churches,’ in xv. 41.”

Any one who thinks it worth while to pursue the grammatical question further, may find it treated at large in Bäumlein, *Untersuchungen über griechische Partikeln*, 174–184, in Hartung, *Partikellehre*, II., p. 393, in Grimm's *Clavis*, sub. voc. *μέν*, and in Dr. Moulton's note on *μέν οὖν*, in his edition of Winer's *Grammar of N.T. Greek*, 1877, sect. lxiii., ii. 2 *e.*

In the passage before us I do not think that the connexion between *v.* 5 and *v.* 6, in whichever way it is viewed, has any material bearing upon the main issue, What were “ the Churches of Galatia ” to which St. Paul's Epistle is addressed ?

II. The most important and at the same time the most difficult point in the interpretation of the passage is the meaning to be assigned to the words *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν*. (*a*) Do they denote two districts or one? And (*b*) what geographical position is to be assigned to the district or districts so denoted ?

(*a*) “ Professor Ramsay,” as Mr. Chase says correctly, (THE EXPOSITOR, 1893, p. 404), “ drawing attention to the absence of the article in the true text before *Γαλατικὴν χώραν*, says that the phrase *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν* (xvi.

6) means “ ‘the country which is Phrygian and Galatic,’ a single district to which both epithets apply . . . ‘the country which, according to one way of speaking is Phrygian, but which is also called Galatic ’ ” (p. 77 f.), “which may in English be most idiomatically rendered ‘the Phrygo-Galatic’ territory ” (p. 79 f.).”

In this view Professor Ramsay has the support of the Revised Version, which gives “the region of Phrygia and Galatia” instead of the rendering in the A.V., “Phrygia and the region of Galatia.”

The same interpretation was strongly and repeatedly asserted by Bishop Lightfoot: *Galatians*, p. 22: “The form of the Greek expression implies that Phrygia and Galatia here are not to be regarded as separate districts. The country which was now evangelized might be called indifferently Phrygia or Galatia.” Compare *Colossians*, p. 23: “ ‘The Phrygian and Galatian country.’ ”

Against this view Mr. Chase contends in his second article (*THE EXPOSITOR*, May, 1894, p. 331 ff.), that St. Luke is referring to two separate districts, chiefly on the ground that *Φρυγίαν* must be a substantive. “I will state again,” he writes, “somewhat more explicitly than I did in my former article, what appear to me to be convincing reasons for thinking that St. Luke in Acts xvi. 6 uses *Φρυγία* as a substantive.

“ (i.) In xviii. 23, St. Luke uses the phrase *τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν*. Must not *Φρυγίαν* here be a substantive? Is it not certain that, if St. Luke were employing the word as an adjective, he would have written *τὴν Γαλατικὴν καὶ Φρυγίαν χώραν* ? ”

To these questions there can be but one answer: Mr. Chase is undoubtedly right so far.

He proceeds: “We must interpret xvi. 6 in the light of xviii. 23,” and adds a note: “Though Bishop Lightfoot took *Φρυγίαν* as an adjective in xvi. 6, he is careful to tran-

slate it as a substantive in xviii. 23: "This brought him to 'the Galatian country and Phrygia'" (*Galatians*, p. 24; so *Colossians*, p. 24). I cannot think that he was justified in separating the two passages."

Mr. Chase has another passage in his favour: "(ii.) *Φρυγία* is beyond dispute a substantive in the one passage besides xvi. 6, xviii. 23, in which St. Luke mentions the country, viz., Acts ii. 10 (*Φρυγίαν τε καὶ Παμφυλίαν*)."

This is unquestionably the strongest point in Mr. Chase's objection to Bishop Lightfoot's view of the phrase before us; and it is certain that the Bishop was fully aware of his apparent inconsistency in taking *Φρυγίαν* as an adjective in xvi. 6, and as a substantive in xviii. 23. His reasons for so doing are repeatedly and deliberately stated.

In *Galatians*, p. 22, note 3, he writes: "The second *τὴν* of the received reading ought to be omitted with the best MSS., in which case *Φρυγίαν* becomes an adjective. . . . On the occasion of the second visit the words are (xviii. 23) *διερχόμενος καθεξῆς τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν*. The general direction of St. Paul's route was rather westward than eastward, and this is expressed in the second passage by naming Galatia before Phrygia, but it is quite consistent with the expression in the first, where the two districts are not separated."

Again (*Colossians*, p. 23, note 1) the Bishop writes: "Acts xvi. 6, *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν*, the correct reading. For this use of *Φρυγίαν* as an adjective comp. Mark i. 5: *πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα*, John iii. 22 *εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν γῆν* Luke iii. 1 *τῆς Ἰουραίας καὶ Τραχωνίτιδος χώρας*, Acts xiii. 14 *Ἀντιόχεια τὴν Πισιδίαν* (the correct reading)."

"This view," Mr. Chase writes on p. 404, "is adopted, apparently not without some misgiving, by Mr. Page, whose notes on the Acts are without a rival as a scholarly exposition of the text."

As Mr. Page is a classical scholar of the highest acade-

mical distinction, it may be well to quote his own words on v. 6. “διήλθον δέ, ‘They went through the Phrygian and Galatian district, because they had been hindered from preaching in Asia.’ They turned off either to the North or North-West.”

“T.R. (*Textus Receptus*) has διελθόντες δέ τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν, obscuring and probably altering the sense. τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν, “not two districts (as the reading of T.R. makes it) but one. It was the country ‘which might be called indifferently Phrygia or Galatia.’ See however xviii. 23.”

If Mr. Page had any misgiving about this interpretation, as Mr. Chase suggests, it can only be found in the reference to xviii. 23; but on turning to his note on that passage, I find no more than these words: “For ἡ Γαλ. χώρα, which is here distinguished from Phrygia, see xvi. 6, n.” Mr. Page thus seems to adopt the interpretation of Bishop Lightfoot without any reserve.

Weiss adopts the same construction: “Observe the expression Γαλατικὴν χώραν instead of Galatia, which might also indicate the Province in a more comprehensive sense. But then Φρυγίαν, which is connected with it under one article, must also be an adjective, as Ἀντιόχειαν τὴν Πισιδίαν in xiii. 14.”

Bishop Jacobson, in the *Speaker's Commentary*, gives the same interpretation of the phrase as Bishop Lightfoot, Dr. Weiss, and Mr. Page. The statements of these eminent scholars make it clear that, in their opinion, the phrase not only may but must indicate one district “the Phrygian and Galatian country.”

There is in fact a very real and strong objection to taking Φρυγίαν as a substantive, in the presence of the adjective Γαλατικὴν “under the *vinculum* of the common article” and qualifying χώραν: for the geographical idea expressed by χώραν is one to which Φρυγίαν and Γαλατικὴν, both taken

as adjectives, are equally and peculiarly appropriate. It can hardly be doubtful in such a case that we ought to prefer the well-known rule of construction, which would make *Φρυγίαν* an adjective.

Mr. Chase however argues (EXPOSITOR, May, 1894, p. 333) that the two words *Γαλατικὴ χώρα* coalesce so as to express a single idea. "They are, in fact, compound nouns; and thus the construction *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν* is seen to be parallel to *τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ Σαμαρίᾳ* (Acts i. 8), *τὴν Μακεδονίαν καὶ Ἀχαΐαν* (xix. 21); see also viii. 1, ix. 31, xv. 3, xxvii. 5."

In all these examples however both members are simple substantives, and Mr. Chase has quoted none in which the second member consists of an adjective and substantive, none therefore parallel *in form* to *τ. Φ. κ. Γαλατικὴν χώραν*. For a *grammatical* parallelism what is required is identity, not of idea, but of *form*.

If St. Luke meant *Φρυγίαν* to be taken as a substantive, he should have written *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατίαν*: and it is no answer to this to say that he wished to avoid *Γαλατίαν*, because it might have been understood in the political sense of the Roman Province Galatia; for "Galatia" has also the popular sense which makes it equivalent to Galatia proper, and it would here have been connected with *Φρυγίαν*, which has a popular sense and no other, so that there could have been no doubt as to the sense in this passage.

(b) We have next to inquire, what is the country thus described as "the region of Phrygia and Galatia," and then further, what are "the Churches of Galatia" addressed by St. Paul in his Epistle?

These are two distinct questions, though closely connected, and liable to be confused by advocates of the rival theories concerning the position of the Galatian Churches. We must be careful therefore to remember that the convenient phrases "North Galatian theory" and "South

Galatian theory" refer only to the Churches addressed in the Epistle, and not to the interpretation of the phrase τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν, which is prior and independent.

The importance of this distinction will appear as we proceed with our inquiry. It will be convenient to quote first the statement of Bishop Lightfoot, one of the ablest and most determined advocates of "the North Galatian theory."

The Gauls, he tells us, in their first invasion, about 279 B.C., "overran the greater part of Asia Minor. They laid the whole continent west of Taurus under tribute" (*Galatians*, p. 5). Afterwards, by successive checks, "they were compressed within comparatively narrow limits in the interior of Asia Minor. The country to which they were thus confined, the Galatia of history, is a broad strip of land over two hundred miles in length, stretching from north-east to south-west" (p. 6).

The Bishop's expression "the Galatia of history" is fully justified by the manner in which Strabo, writing after the division of Asia Minor into provinces by Augustus, still speaks of "the country of the Gallo-Græci *which is called Galatia*" (c. 130 init.), and says that the Gauls had been permitted to occupy "what is *now called Galatia* and Gallo-Græcia" (c. 566).

But "Galatia" as a Roman province would include, besides the country properly so called, Lycaonia, Isauria, the south-eastern district of Phrygia, and a portion of Pisidia. Lycaonia is especially mentioned as belonging to it, and there is evidence that the cities of Derbe and Lystra in particular were included within its boundaries" (*Galatians*, p. 7). But on the other hand "St. Luke distinctly calls Lystra and Derbe 'cities of Lycaonia' (Acts xiv. 6), while he no less distinctly assigns Antioch to Pisidia (xiii. 14); a convincing proof that in the language of the day they were not regarded as Galatian towns. Lastly, the expres-

sion used in the Acts of St. Paul's visit to these parts, 'the Phrygian and Galatian country,' shows that the district intended was not Lycaonia and Pisidia, but some region which might be said to belong either to Phrygia or Galatia, or the parts of each contiguous to the other" (Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 19).

Prof. Ramsay and Mr. Chase accept only parts of this statement, and each a different part.

Mr. Chase, as we have seen, holds that *v.* 6 describes a journey through two separate districts which were traversed successively, namely Phrygia and Galatia, but agrees with the Bishop that by "Galatia" in the Epistle we are to understand the country popularly so called, that is, Northern Galatia.

Professor Ramsay, on the other hand, holds that the journey described in *v.* 6 led from Lystra onwards through "the country which is Phrygian and Galatic," and that this description denotes "the parts of Phrygia, Lycaonia, and Pisidia, which were by the Romans incorporated in the vast province of Galatia" (*Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 9), and is strictly true of "the country about Iconium and Antioch" (*ib.*, p. 78, cf. p. 81). Through *this* country St. Paul and his company had passed *before* they were "forbidden to preach the word in Asia"; but then could this be what St. Luke calls "the Phrygian and Galatian country"? Professor Ramsay holds that it was, and that, instead of "They went through the region of Phrygia and Galatia, *having been forbidden*," etc., the rendering ought to be "and were forbidden," etc., as in A.V. Whether the grammatical construction of the participle *κωλυθέντες* required by this view of the passage is admissible, is a point which must be considered later on. For the present I may be allowed to assume that the Revised Version, "*having been forbidden*," represents the right order of events; and if so, the country about Iconium and Antioch could not be

“the region of Phrygia and Galatia” through which they passed *after* “having been forbidden,” etc.

Proceeding with the geographical question, we may now ask, Why does St. Luke use the expression *Γαλατική χώρα* instead of *Γαλατία*? Wendt replies that this “circumstantial expression” is used “to distinguish this district from the Roman Province Galatia”: that is from “Galatia” in the official sense. May we not say with equal truth, that it is used to distinguish the region in question from “Galatia” in the popular sense, that is, from Northern Galatia?

Without denying or doubting that the description is in itself, apart from the context, “strictly true of the country about Iconium and Antioch,” to which Professor Ramsay applies it, I believe that this also, like Galatia proper, is too narrow a limitation of a phrase which seems to be purposely chosen as a general and comprehensive description rather than as the exclusive denomination of any one particular district. It denotes, as Bishop Lightfoot says, “some region which might be said to belong either to Phrygia or Galatia, or *the parts of each contiguous to the other.*” (The italics are mine.) The border-lands of Phrygia and Galatia exactly correspond to this description; and Mr. Chase (THE EXPOSITOR, 1893, p. 406) opportunely reminds us that “districts known as Phrygia and Galatia lie between the cities of the south, which St. Paul leaves behind him, and Bithynia on the north, to which he ultimately directs his steps” (xvi. 1 ff., 7).

The whole district thus traversed belonged originally to Phrygia, but had been overrun by the Gauls, and parts of it were included in the Roman province of Galatia.¹ Thus the eastern border of Phrygia was probably no better defined than its western boundaries as described by Strabo, c. 628 f.: “The parts next in order towards the south are intermingled (*ἐμπλοκὰς ἔχει*) with these places as far as

¹ See Professor Ramsay's *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, p. 254.

Taurus, so that the Phrygian, and Carian, and Lydian, and even the Mysian parts are difficult to distinguish as they lie alongside of one another. And this confusion is not a little increased by the fact that the Romans did not divide them according to tribes, but arranged in a different manner the administrative districts (*διοικήσεις*) in which they hold their conventions and courts of justice."

Of such a borderland there could be no more appropriate description than that which St. Luke adopts, "the Phrygian and Galatian region."

We may now endeavour to trace the Apostle's route as closely as the brief record of it permits.

The last place actually mentioned as visited by St. Paul is Lystra; but it is agreed on both sides that, in accordance with the original purpose of his journey (xv. 36), he also visited Iconium and Antioch. Here he was on the ordinary and frequented route from Antioch to Asia and its capital, Ephesus. But "having been forbidden by the Holy Ghost to speak the word in Asia," the Apostle now took a northerly and north-westerly direction, the first part of the route leading him through a region to which the description "Phrygian and Galatian" is exactly applicable. This is, in fact, admitted by Bishop Lightfoot in his later work, *Colossians*, p. 24 :—"His course, as determined by its extreme limits—Antioch, in Pisidia, its starting point, and Alexandria Troas, its termination—would be northward for the first part of the way, and thus would lie *on the borderland of Phrygia and Galatia.*" (The italics are mine.)

Through this "Phrygian and Galatian region" they appear to have travelled northward until "*they were come over against Mysia.*" If they proceeded in this northerly course as far as Nakolia, they would there be "on a line with Mysia" (*κατὰ Μυσίαν*),¹ and on the direct way to Bithynia

¹ This sense of *κατά* is extremely well illustrated by Professor Ramsay's reference to *Herod*, I. 76, where Pteria, in Cappadocia, is said to be "about on

through Dorylæum. From the place where they were forbidden "to go into Bithynia," their route to Alexandria Troas would lie nearly due west.

It seems impossible, without doing extreme violence to St. Luke's narrative, to intrude into such a journey as this a digression of at least three hundred miles eastward to Pessinus, Ancyra, and Javium, and a long period of most important missionary labour of which the author gives not the slightest hint. But that is what is, and must be, done by the advocates of the North-Galatian theory. See Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 19; and on the difficulties involved in the theory compare Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 83.

The absolute silence of St. Luke on so important a part of St. Paul's apostolic work as the foundation of the churches of Galatia seems to me quite inexplicable.

Bishop Lightfoot endeavours to support the conjectural journey by an equally conjectural motive, namely, that "the historian gladly drew a veil over the infancy of a Church which swerved so soon and so widely from the purity of the gospel" (*Galatians*, p. 20).

Mr. Chase thinks it a simple explanation of the Apostle's route and plans to say (EXPOSITOR, 1893, p. 415) that "St. Paul just now had no definite and well-considered plan. He had had a clear policy—the evangelization of Asia; but he had been prevented from carrying it out in a way which he dared not gainsay, but which he could not as yet explain. He was bewildered. He allowed himself to drift. He moved from place to place, waiting on Providence." The explanation might be less improbable, if we had a shadow of evidence for the supposed fact which it is intended to explain.

a line with Sinope," though distant from it, according to Spruner's map, twice as far as Nakolia or Dorylæum from the frontier of Mysia. Cf. *Herod*, II. 153 with Bähr's notes on both passages.

Mr. Page, in a note on *v. 6*, offers a better, though not quite adequate explanation: "The narrative here is extremely brief, the writer being clearly anxious to pass on to the preaching of Paul in Europe." I would rather say that the writer passed on rapidly, because the journey itself was direct, and uninterrupted by any important incident such as the supposed preaching and founding of churches in Northern Galatia. St. Paul's mission to Europe was, according to the indications given in the narrative, the divinely appointed purpose of the whole journey. Twice he is forbidden to turn aside from the direct route between Antioch and Troas. "To speak the word in Asia," "to go into Bithynia," would each have been a cause of much delay; and in each case the Apostle found himself constrained by the Spirit's guidance to go straight forward on his appointed way. One of these Divine interpositions occurred before, and one after the supposed digression into Northern Galatia. Do they not make an intermediate sojourn in that district, which must have been of long duration, and of which the writer gives no hint whatever, quite inconceivable?

The natural meaning of the narrative seems to be that, as M. Renan says, "The apostolic band made almost at one stretch (*d'une seule traite*) a journey of more than a hundred leagues, across a country little known, and one which in the absence of Roman colonies and Jewish synagogues offered them none of the opportunities which they had hitherto found." (*S. Paul*, p. 128.)

Bishop Lightfoot (*Colossians*, pp. 24–28) has criticised M. Renan's account of the journey in a long and elaborate note, one portion of which shows, if I may venture to say so, far less than his usual accuracy. I mark by italics the phrases which appear to be inconsistent with the order of St. Luke's narrative.

"On the first occasion St. Luke states that the Apostle

set out on his journey with quite different intentions, but that *after he had got well to the north of Asia Minor* he was driven by a series of Divine intimations to proceed first to Troas and thence to cross over into Europe. This narrative seems to me to imply that he starts for his further travels from some point in the western part of Galatia proper. *When he comes to the borders of Mysia, he designs bearing to the left and preaching in Asia, but a Divine voice forbids him.*"

Here the order of St. Luke's narrative is strangely disregarded, as will at once appear from a glance at the original words: διήλθον δὲ τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν, κωλυθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος λαλῆσαι τὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ· ἐλθόντες δὲ κατὰ τὴν Μυσίαν ἐπέιραζον εἰς τὴν Βιθυνίαν πορευθῆναι· καὶ οὐκ εἴασεν αὐτοὺς τὸ Πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ.

Can any one, with these words before him, be induced to believe that St. Paul had come to the borders of Mysia, before he was forbidden to preach in Asia?

Further, Mr. Chase is, I think, fully justified by the ordinary usage of the Greek participle in maintaining, (EXPOSITOR, Dec., 1893, p. 409) that "the reason why they went northwards and not westwards, as left to their own judgment they would have done, was that they had *already* 'been forbidden of the Holy Spirit to speak the word in Asia.'"

III. This remark leads us to notice the third point of Greek syntax, on which Mr. Page and Professor Ramsay are throughout the discussion entirely at variance.

The latter in his "Epilogue" (EXPOSITOR, April 1894, p. 293) adheres to his original view (*Church in Roman Empire*, p. 9) that St. Luke "varies the succession of verbs by making some of them participles. The sequence of the verbs is also the sequence of time: (1) They went through the Phrygo-Galatic land; (2) they were forbidden to speak in Asia, etc." Professor Ramsay adds ("Epilogue," p. 279),

“Were this question to be argued out, numerous examples which justify in the completest way my interpretation of Acts xvi. 6 might be quoted.”

On this point my learned friend, Dr. Sanday, has kindly called my attention to the remarks in Mr. Burton's very suggestive and valuable treatise on the *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*, Chicago, 1893. Mr. Burton begins by admitting (§ 145) that “no certain instance of an aorist participle used adverbially as the equivalent of an adverbial or co-ordinate clause, and referring to a subsequent action, has been observed in classical Greek, though one or two possible ones occur.” Mr. Burton gives a reference to Demosthenes, which I am unable to verify, and another to Thucydides, ii. 49, 3, the well-known passage in the description of the plague: *λύγξ τε τοῖς πλείοσιν ἐνέπεσε κενή, σπασμὸν ἐνδιδούσα ἰσχυρόν, τοῖς μὲν μετὰ ταῦτα λωφήσαντα, τοῖς δὲ καὶ πολλῶ ὕστερον*. The only doubt about the meaning of the passage was caused by Dobree's strange proposal to make *λωφήσαντα* agree with *ταῦτα*. It may, I think, be properly rendered thus: “Most of the patients were attacked by a dry hiccough, causing a violent spasm, which in some cases abated presently (*μετὰ ταῦτα*), but in others after a long time.” The participle *λωφήσαντα* represents an incident subsequent to *σπασμὸν ἐνδιδούσα*, but too closely connected with it as a description of *σπασμὸν* to give any support to the proposed construction of *κωλυθέντες*.

“For New Testament instances,” Mr. Burton proceeds, see Acts xxv. 13; also xvi. 23; xxii. 24; xxiii. 35; xxiv. 23. In all these cases it is scarcely possible to doubt that the participle (which is without the article and follows the verb) is equivalent to *καὶ* with a co-ordinate verb, and refers to an action subsequent in fact and in thought to that of the verb which it follows. These instances are perhaps due to Aramaic influence.”

It is true that in some of these cases the action denoted by the participle is in time subsequent to that of the verb, but in others it appears to be simultaneous, and in all it is *in thought* closely connected with and dependent upon the action of the verb.

Thus in xxv. 13: *κατήντησαν . . . ἀσπασάμενοι* (the true reading) the journey of Agrippa and Bernice to Cæsarea had for its very purpose the salutation of the new Procurator.

In xvi. 23: *ἔβαλον εἰς φυλακὴν, παραγγείλαντες τῷ δεσμοφύλακι*, the action is simultaneous, and we might fairly translate—"cast them into prison, with a command to the jailor." A similar explanation may be easily applied to the other examples.

Dr. Sanday has kindly drawn my attention to a passage in *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Reub. γ¹ fin.: *καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐπένθει ἐπ' ἐμοί, μηκέτι ἀψάμενος αὐτῆς*. The meaning appears to be that Jacob was grieved over his son, and never touched his concubine again. Here it may fairly be said that the action of the participle is connected with, and even dependent on, the continued grief of Jacob over his son's offence.

In my own reading I have recently noticed another singular passage in Clem. Alex., *Protrept.*, c. 2 (p. 5, Migne), quoted by Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.*, p. 64a: (*Ζεὺς*) *μίγνυται δράκων γερόμενος, ὅς ἦν ἐλεγχθεὶς*. "He makes his approach in the form of a serpent, it being afterwards discovered who he was." This, perhaps, gives some support to the construction for which Professor Ramsay contends, as the action described in the participle, though connected with what precedes, is not dependent on, but rather contrasted with it. Enough at all events has been quoted to show that, in later Greek, the learned Professor's view is in itself quite capable of being defended, though not applicable, I think, to the present passage.

If however I may be allowed to express my own opinion of the matter, I do not think that any sufficient reason has yet been shown for introducing what is certainly an unusual construction into the passage before us. There is no doubt that "Phrygo-Galatic" is a description which might, in other contexts, be applied either, as by Bishop Lightfoot, to Northern Galatia, or, as by Professor Ramsay, to Southern Galatia, both those districts having originally been occupied by Phrygians. But in its present context, as I have endeavoured to show above, it can only mean the borderland of Phrygia and Galatia northward of Antioch, through which the travellers passed *after* "having been forbidden to speak the word in Asia."

It may be well to add Mr. Chase's last words on this point (EXPOSITOR May, 1894, p. 342): "It was in reference to the construction διήλθον . . . κωλυθέντες that I said that in my belief the South Galatian theory is shipwrecked on the rock of Greek Grammar. I venture to repeat this verdict." Were I Professor Ramsay's advocate, I should plead that "the verdict" is not in accordance with the evidence. For it has been shown above (1) that his proposed construction is not impossible in later Greek, and (2) that "the South Galatian theory," rightly understood, does not depend at all upon this construction, but solely upon the right interpretation of the geographical expression, τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν.

In this belief I am strongly confirmed by finding that it agrees with the conclusion which so distinguished a classical scholar as the Rev. Frederick Rendall has reached by a totally different line of argument (EXPOSITOR, April, 1894, p. 254). And sharing, as I do most fully, Mr. Rendall's admiration of the learning of "our great Church historian," Bishop Lightfoot, I gladly conclude this article with the words of his elder schoolfellow: "If an enlarged knowledge of the facts bids us change our opinion and distrust his

verdict, it is no true loyalty to the memory of so fearless and open-minded a searcher after truth to shut our eyes to the growing light, and hold fast by ancient authority."

E. H. GIFFORD.

THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST'S KINGDOM.

IV. CEREMONIAL.

OUR Lord's idea of righteousness is illustrated by His attitude towards the outward religious observances of His day. What His attitude was is not at once obvious. The teaching of St. Paul regarding the relation of ceremonial to morality is easily intelligible, because in more than one of his epistles the subject is explicitly discussed. Pushing his idea of the spirituality of the religion of Christ to its logical issue, St. Paul declared that ritual belonged to the childhood stage of religion. It was part of that system of tutors and governors which was left behind by the spiritual adult. It was the symbol which became insignificant when the reality appeared: the shadow which was displaced by the body, which was Christ. When St. Paul expressly handles any subject he leaves one in no doubt of his mind: but the ideas of our Lord can only be gathered from a careful examination of His conduct as well as of His words.

Respect for the ceremonial law is legibly written in the life of Jesus. He was circumcised and thus bound theoretically to the whole ceremonial law; He ate the Passover and paid the Temple tax. In compliance with the injunction of the ceremonial law He commanded the healed leper to show himself to the priest. The fiery zeal which usually smouldered in His breast was fanned into consuming flame by the desecration of the centre and stronghold of ritual and ceremony, His Father's house. Sacred places, sacred seasons, sacred actions and sacred persons were alike

respected by Him, and this respect He enjoined on His disciples in such utterances as that of Matthew xxiii. 2, 3 : "The Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do."

At the same time there are in the Gospels intimations that our Lord foresaw the abolition or absorption of all ceremony in Himself and in His kingdom, and that the respect He showed to the enactments of the Levitical law was respect to an obsolescent institution. He sheds tears of regret, indeed, over the anticipated destruction of the Holy City and its temple, but it is with no apprehension that the interests of His Kingdom will be interfered with. He is aware that the Temple has served its purpose, He intimates that it will be replaced by His body, and He declares that henceforth men will worship the Father in spirit (that is, without regard to special locality) and in truth (that is, in reality, not by symbol and observance). Similarly, in His last Passover, He intimates that even this great national religious celebration, in some respects the very heart of the Jewish ritual was passing away, having at length been fulfilled by growing into the memento of the deliverance accomplished by His own death.

It must also be borne in mind that even while conforming to usage and outwardly submitting to traditional enactments, He did so under protest and with significant comments. This is especially apparent in his payment of the Temple-tax, as recorded in Matthew xvii. 24-27. The half-shekel, or *δίδραχμον*, was originally exacted by Moses as the ransom of each Jew, and in our Lord's time was applied to the up-keep of the Temple.¹ Peter, when asked whether his Master paid the tax, unhesitatingly affirmed that He did. This of itself is strong evidence that our

¹ In v. 27 Jesus uses *ἀντί*, apparently with some reminiscence of the original meaning of the tax.

Lord was not known by His disciples to neglect any part of the law. But on this occasion, while our Lord pays the didrachma, He does so under protest and with explanation. By a single parabolic question He leads Peter to see the unreasonableness of all such exactions. "What thinkest thou, Simon? The kings of the earth, from whom do they receive toll or tribute? From their sons, or from strangers?" (*ἀλλοτρίων*, subjects not their own children). Peter answers, "From strangers," from those who are not their own children. "Therefore," says our Lord, "are the sons free."¹ The application of this condensed parable Peter could not miss. If earthly kings do not support their house by exactions from the royal family, the heavenly King could require no tax from any who stood to Him in the relation of sons. It has been questioned whether Jesus here means to claim a special relationship to God, and consequently a special and unique exemption from the tax, or if He means to include with Himself, under the term "sons," Peter and all believing persons. The former opinion is advocated by Meyer and Bleek, the latter by Olshausen, Keim and Weiss. The fact that our Lord miraculously paid the tax for Peter as well as for Himself, and the manner in which He uses the plural throughout, although the question of tax-paying was raised solely on His own account, seem to indicate that He meant to exempt all the sons of God from enforced payments. And He pays the tax, not because it is strictly just and reasonable, but "lest we cause them to stumble"; that is to say, lest it should be supposed that He had no interest in the worship of the Temple and no desire to maintain it.

Evidently, then, it is the *compulsoriness* of the payment He objects to. His Father's house was to be maintained, but not by exactions legally enforced on willing and unwilling alike. He desired that God's children should sup-

¹ Thus in opposition to *servi* the Roman children were pre-eminently *liberi*.

port and frequent the Father's house, but it jarred upon Him to have this support exacted as a tax from all and sundry. The children are free, let their gifts and service also be free. The little parable, like other parables, cannot be applied in all its parts. It cannot be said that the upkeep of God's worship should be left to those who are not His children, and that they should be compelled by law to maintain it. That is a lesson which would seem incongruous in the lips of our Lord. What is meant by the parable is that the taxing of God's children for the maintenance of His house is unreasonable. His service must be free, voluntary.

Here our Lord lays down a fundamental principle governing all religious observances. The tax-paying spirit is the bane of worship. Elaborate ceremonial, with its rigid order, its punctilios, its disabilities, its exactions, its inevitable observances, tended to foster the idea to which men are naturally prone, that worship is a paying of dues. Here as elsewhere Christ intimates that such a relation between God and us as moves us to offer Him payments in the spirit of subjects who must pay or fall under legal penalties, is no true relation. God means us to be His children, and therefore free. He repudiates what we pay Him as a tax. He does not desire what we render on exaction. Service that is done by constraint, as a payment of taxes, He refuses. We are to enter into the freedom of His own Son, and to learn from Him a free spirit and bearing. The teaching, then, which, through Peter, He conveys to His church is that in His kingdom all is free, spontaneous, spiritual, and that all that is legal and compulsory, all outward exactions, are doomed.

But observances are dangerous not only because they oppress and benumb the spontaneity and freedom of religious service, but because they are apt to usurp an importance that does not belong to them, and to be considered

ends in themselves, and not means. No observance is appointed for its own sake, as if there were some virtue in the mere performance of the thing prescribed. It was this lesson which our Lord taught in His treatment of the Sabbath law, and which He enounced in the words: "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath" (Mark ii. 27). It is for man's aid all observances are appointed; their existence is justified only in so far as they attain that end, and that end is always greater than the means used for its attainment. The relation of man to the world is on the whole such that life can be maintained and all earthly affairs managed in six-sevenths of our time. The tendency of some of the factors in civilization is to overdrive men, and induce the idea that this world is all, and demands all our time. The Sabbath checks and rebukes such tendencies. Every seventh day says to us: You are not merely a world's drudge, a machine for the production of earthly goods, you are a man, a child of the eternal; you are here not merely to accumulate money and live a life of sense; you are here to cultivate friendship, to educate yourself in all good, to know God and become meet for the inheritance of the saints in light.

This was explicitly taught when Israel came out of Egypt. To this overdriven race of slaves a weekly rest was a new sensation, and nothing could be a more delightful badge of their freedom than cessation from toil every seventh day. It was a new idea to them to have one day in seven all their own, a day in which they were loosed from earthly toil, and were provided for by Him who gave them the day. "For that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore He giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days." Nothing could have more simply taught them the significance of the transition they had made from the service of an earthly master to the service of Jehovah.

By the idea that lay at the heart of the observance, by the intention which created the day, our Lord would regulate the keeping of it. The spirit of the law must be satisfied. The day was appointed to promote the good of man, to be a pleasure and a boon, not a vexation and a burden. Whatever best promotes man's welfare, best satisfies the Sabbath law. Whatever most effectually sets him free from the oppression of the world, from the grinding toil and feverish anxieties of life, best fulfils the intention of God in appointing a weekly rest. Any thing which hinders or retards physical, mental, or spiritual welfare is a breach of the law.

In the Sabbath law as originally given no rules were laid down for its observance save that which enjoined abstinence from work. Israel was not commanded to spend the day in worship. And the only rule for the observance of the day is that it must be spent in frank fellowship with Him who gave it, and with a sincere desire to satisfy the *animus imponentis*. Accepting the day as God's gift and as the badge of our freedom as His children, seeking to enter into His intention in giving the day and remembering the kind of rest our Lord has opened to us by His rising from the dead on the first day of the week, we are not likely either to profane the day and abuse it, or to make it a burden by our Pharisaic scruples. It is not the day that is to be observed, but ourselves. The day cannot be harmed or benefited; it is we ourselves who may take injury or help out of its provision. It is only the means: our welfare is the end.

Another danger in outward observances is that they take the place of the permanent moral obligations. When certain performances are added to the moral law, so that those who rigorously attend to them are esteemed extra-religious, the tendency is to prefer these external observances to the moral law. These extras come to be considered the peculiar and distinguishing mark of a religious man, so that a per-

son's religious status or rank is measured by his observance of these, rather than by his adherence to justice, truth, charity, filial piety. A man is reckoned religious or irreligious according as certain external actions or habits appear or do not appear in his life; as that he has prayers in his family, that he is a regular Church-goer, that he supports religious schemes and so forth; and not as he is or is not honourable in business, sweet-tempered and patient in his family, helpful to his relatives, unworldly in his tastes, self-denying and merciful. This is the inevitable result of allowing ceremonial to rank with moral actions.

The demoralizing influence of allowing to ceremonial actions a place which belongs only to what is moral is illustrated and exposed by our Lord in His reply to the Jerusalem scribes and Pharisees who found fault with His disciples for neglecting to wash their hands before eating. As the Jews did not use forks or spoons, but carried their food to the mouth with the fingers, to wash the hands before eating was a seemly precaution. But it was not through any special love of cleanliness, but from fear of ceremonial defilement that this custom was encouraged by the Pharisees. To touch a Gentile or anything a Gentile had used, or to touch a dead body or a defiled person was enough to involve ceremonial defilement, and unless the hands were washed this defilement passed to the food and so to the man inextricably. The "elders" taught in so many words that he who ate with unwashed hands was as bad as a murderer or a fornicator.¹ Wetstein illustrates the stringency of this traditional law by an anecdote of Rabbi Akiba. While in prison he received daily from a friendly ministering Rabbi as much water as served for drinking and washing. On one occasion the gaoler spilt the half. Rabbi Akiba, notwithstanding the remonstrance

¹ Passages are cited in Wünsche's *Erläuterung aus Talmud und Midrasch*, pp. 180-1.

of his friend, used the remainder for washing his hands, because "he who eats with unwashed hands perpetrates a crime worthy of death; it is better that I die, than that I transgress the appointments of my forefathers." A trifling and purely external traditional custom had not only been raised to the level of the weightiest moral laws, but had thrust these laws aside. Under the guise of an extra-religiousness there were introduced flagrant transgressions of fundamental morality. "For the sake of your tradition ye make the commandment of God of none effect."

Dr. Bruce perfectly interprets our Lord's meaning in the following paraphrase: "Those washings may not seem seriously to conflict with the great matters of the law, but to be at most only trifling and contemptible. But the case is not so. To treat trifles as serious matters, as matters of conscience, is degrading and demoralizing. No man can do that without being or becoming a moral imbecile or a hypocrite; either one who is incapable of discerning what is vital and what not in morals; or one who finds his interest in getting trifles such as washing of hands, or paying tithe of herbs, to be accepted as the important matters, and the truly great things of the law—justice, mercy and faith—quietly pushed aside as if they were of no moment whatever."

That this was our Lord's meaning is shown by the instance which He Himself cites to illustrate His statement. Filial piety is not only an instinct of nature and a duty recognised as fundamental by all nations, but in the Mosaic law it held a conspicuous place. But even this law was set aside by the tradition of the Rabbis, who taught that a man had only to pronounce the word "korban" over any of his possessions, and from that moment his obligation to bestow it on his parents was disannulled. And the reasoning which led to this monstrous conclusion had a great appearance of religiousness. "Korban," meaning

“an offering,” was the word employed by the Israelite when he devoted anything to God. After anything had been declared “korban” to a person, he could as little use it as he could take a sacred article and put it to a profane use. Thus if a person sees strangers eating figs which belong to him, and he says “These are a korban to you,” the strangers cannot eat them.¹ So that an unfilial son had only to say to his father, ‘Whatever thou mightest be profited by me is korban,’ and, according to the Rabbis, the father could no longer be supported by the son. This was all the more remarkable because in interpreting the commandment, “Honour thy father and thy mother,” the doctors of the law held that by “honour” it was meant that the son must provide his father with food and raiment; and yet by the tradition of the elders, the son might absolve himself from all filial obligation by saying, “Korban is the food and raiment I ought to give you.” And the significant feature of the transaction was that a word was used which gave the appearance of religion to the unfilial act. The first of human duties was evaded under the guise—the thinnest possible guise—of extra-devotion to God.

There is then always this double danger in ceremonial, that it depreciates and displaces the moral law, and that it tends to externalize religion. By erecting these ultra-moral obligations into a standard for the religious man, the Rabbis had at once undermined the moral law and given to the externals of religion an importance that threatened spiritual interests. As Dr. Wendt remarks: “It was inconceivable to Jesus that God would make His fellowship with man dependent upon any kind of merely external conditions.” Religion is a spiritual affair. It is the fellowship of the Father of spirits with the spirits of His children. “God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit.” Only in so far as the spirit

¹ See Ginsburg in the *Bible Educator*, i. 155.

is moved and aided by what is external are external rites and ceremonies legitimate. "There is nothing from without a man that entering into him can defile [or cleanse] him : but the things which come out of him, those are they that defile the man"; an utterance which, as Mark indicates, makes all meats clean, abolishes the distinction between clean and unclean meats and so annuls the ceremonial law.

But the guiding principle for the use of all outward observances is laid down in our Lord's reply to the question, Why do Thy disciples not fast? (Matt. ix. 14; Mark ii. 18; Luke v. 33). This reply enounces the great principle that all outward observances must be determined by the feeling of the worshipper, not by an external and uniform rubric. The question arose out of the feast given by Matthew on the occasion of his call. For our present purpose it does not matter whether the question was raised, as represented in the First Gospel, by the disciples of John or not. Nor does it matter whether the feast was made on one of the ordinary fast days. The Pharisees and the disciples of John agreed in thinking that the adoption of Matthew into the circle of the Messiah's disciples would have been more worthily celebrated by a fast than by a feast, and this brings up the whole question of fasting. Our Lord in His reply cuts to the root of the matter: "Can the bridegroom's friends fast while the bridegroom is with them?" Fasting is impossible in joyous circumstances. The language is strong in all three Gospels, but especially so in the Third: "Are ye able to make the children of the bridal chamber fast?" Propose to a marriage party that instead of feasting they should fast, and see what you will make of it. But we here are a marriage party. The most joyful, fruitful, and indissoluble of marriages is now being consummated. The Christ and His people are being united. Do you suppose that any one who unites himself to me and enters into the

significance of that union is in a mood to fast? It is out of the question. By not fasting we may be violating the Pharisaic ritual: but by fasting we should violate the spirit of the occasion. But fasting is not always inappropriate, and you may have no long time to wait before you see my followers fasting. "The bridegroom will be taken from them, and then shall they fast."

Fasting, then, if it is to be at all, must not be in conformity with an external rule or a fixed season, regardless of the state of feeling. It must be the expression of inward grief. There are occasions in life when we cannot eat. Some loss is so fresh and keenly felt, some sorrow so commanding, some anxiety so possessing, that food cannot be thought of: this is true fasting. The great religions, Judaism, Buddhism, Mohammedanism, and we may add Christianity, have enjoined fasting, and have commonly erred in appointing seasons during which fasting is obligatory irrespective of the feeling of the individual. In appointing a Fast for the people of Scotland, the "Superintendents, Ministers, and Commissioners of Churches reformed, within the realm" address to them a treatise on fasting (drawn up possibly by Knox and Craig) "lest that the Papists shall think that now we authorize and praise that which sometimes we have reprov'd and damn'd in them, or else that the ignorant, who know not the commodity of this godly exercise, shall condemn the same." In this treatise there is much that is wise, and sensible directions are given for the ordering both of private and of public fasting. But the one principle required for our guidance is certainly that laid down by our Lord that it is the feeling which must prompt the outward observance, not the outward observance which is to provoke the feeling.

One at least of the parables which our Lord appends to His reply directly concerns the point in hand. "No man putteth new wine into old wine-skins: else the wine will

burst the skins, and the wine perisheth, and the skins : but they put new wine into fresh wine-skins " (Mark ii. 22). The Pharisees and John's disciples virtually complained that the new spiritual life our Lord had quickened in Matthew had not found expression through the old established forms : that this new wine, in short, was not stored in the old wine-skins. Our Lord replies, Had this been done, both would have been spoiled. The jubilant feeling of Matthew, or of any one rejoicing in the new life, would be stifled and wasted, were you to attempt to confine it in forms that are sufficient to give expression to a hum-drum, Pharisaic, lifeless routine. Shut up this new joy of Matthew's in the old form of fasting, and you spoil both the feeling and the form. The feeling, finding no expression, will impart no impulse and will turn into pained disappointment : and the fast itself being compulsory and incongruous, will be hated by Matthew and will have associations attached to it which will make it hateful in all circumstances. Wine and wine-skins would alike be spoiled. But by allowing Matthew to feast, when feasting most naturally expressed his feeling, the new wine found room for itself in this new skin and both were preserved, while the old bottles of fasting fell into no discredit with him, but stood ready for use on any future occasion when his inward experience was congruous. And according to tradition, Matthew did afterwards become an ascetic living on nuts, berries, and vegetables.

Summing up, then, what we are able to gather from the Gospels regarding our Lord's attitude to the ceremonial law ; keeping in view His zeal for the preservation of the Temple's sanctity, His observance of the Passover, His injunctions to His disciples regarding sacrifice and worship ; and keeping in view also His clear enunciation of principles which explode ceremonialism, the principles of freedom from outward restraint and imposition, of the regulation of

outward religious exercises by the feeling of the worshipper and not by hard and fast rules, and of the seat and source of ethical distinctions being within and not without—keeping in view, that is to say, His respect for ceremonies established by divine law and His clear insight into their temporary character, we see that Jesus was aware that in His kingdom ceremonialism must come to an end, but that He was content to lay down the principles of this abolition and leave them in their own time to accomplish practically what they predicted. To quote Mr. Robert Mackintosh in his vigorous treatment of this subject: “Christ, while He not only respected the ceremonial law but was zealous for its honour, looked calmly forward to the destruction of its centre in the Temple, and omitted ceremony from His positive injunction, while in such diverse points as fasting, distinctions of meats and temple dues, He indicated its incongruence with the spirit of His kingdom.”¹

MARCUS DODS.

ST. PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY.

XVIII. CHRIST.

IT may appear a grave defect in our treatment of Paulinism that so important a theme as this should be taken up at so advanced a stage. Its postponement may be deemed the more reprehensible that there is nothing binding us to a particular order in the arrangement of topics, and that one might begin the presentation of the Pauline conception of Christianity with any of the great cardinal categories of the system, and therefore with the person of Christ.² But there

¹ I desire to acknowledge my indebtedness to Mr. Mackintosh's thorough treatment of this subject in his *Christ and the Jewish Law*.

² Weizsäcker remarks that, in endeavouring to present in a connected view the doctrinal utterances in St. Paul's epistles, “we can start just as well from

are advantages to be gained by assigning to this august theme a position near the end of our discussions. For one thing, we thereby raise the topic out of the region of controversy into the serener atmosphere of calm contemplation. The formulation of Pauline theology had, as we now know, a polemical origin, and from first to last we have been pursuing our studies under the shadow of Judaistic antagonism. But now at length we come into the sunshine, and can contemplate the Lord of the Church as He appears in the pages of the apostle, not as the subject of a theological debate, but as the object of tranquil religious reverence. Another advantage resulting from taking up the present theme at this late stage is that we bring to the study of it all the light to be obtained from acquaintance with the Pauline system of thought in general, and in particular with his *doctrine of redemption*.¹

For it is beyond doubt that St. Paul's conception of Christ's dignity was closely connected with his faith in Christ as the Redeemer. Jesus was for him the Lord because He was the Saviour. The title Lord frequently occurring in the Pauline epistles means "the One who by his death has earned the place of sovereign in my heart, and whom I feel constrained to worship and serve with all my heart and mind."² The doctrine of Christ's Person in these epistles is no mere theological speculation; it is the outgrowth of religious experience, the offspring of the consciousness of personal redemption.

But the connection between the two topics of Christ's Person and work in the apostle's mind is not merely his doctrine of Christ as from that of the means of salvation, or, to go a step further back, from that of sin.—*The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church*, vol. i. p. 141.

¹ R. Schmidt in his work *Die Paulinische Christologie*, 1870, strongly insists on this order of treatment. "The question as to the connection of the doctrine of Christ's Person with the apostle's distinctive doctrine of salvation is indispensable" (p. 4).

² Such is the connection of thought in such texts as *Gal.* vi. 14 and *Rom.* v. 1.

æsthetic. His whole manner of conceiving Christ's redemptive work rendered certain conceptions concerning the Redeemer's Person inevitable. To see this we have only to recall the lessons we have learned in our past studies on the former of these topics.

By the vision on the way to Damascus Saul of Tarsus became convinced that Jesus was the *Christ*. From this conviction the inference immediately followed that Jesus must have suffered on the cross not for His own sin but for the sin of the world, the choice, on the convert's view of the connection between sin and death, lying between these two alternatives. The crucified Christ for the converted Pharisee became a *vicarious* Sufferer. But this character of vicariousness could not be confined to the Passion. It must be extended to the whole earthly experience of Jesus. That experience was full of indignities, beginning with the circumcision of the Child, if not before, and ending with the bitter pains of the cross. These indignities one and all must be conceived of as vicarious, and therefore redemptive collectively and separately. Christ became a Redeemer by subjection to humiliation, and each element in His humiliation made its own contribution to redemption, procuring for men a benefit corresponding to its nature—redemption from legalism, *e.g.* by the Redeemer's subjection to law. Christ's experience of humiliation was an appointment by God. But it was also Christ's own act. He humbled Himself; His whole earthly experience was a long course of *self-humiliation*, and the redemption He achieved was a *redemption by self-humiliation*.

If this be, as I believe it is, St. Paul's theory of redemption, then it inevitably involved one other step—a step out of time into the eternal. The whole earthly life of Christ was a self-humiliation in detail. But how did it begin? In a Divine Mission? Doubtless: God sent His own Son. But to make the conception of Christ's earthly experience as

a humiliation complete is it not necessary to view it as a whole, and regard it as resulting from a foregoing resolve on the part of Christ to enter into such a state? If so, then the necessary presupposition of the Pauline doctrine of redemption is the *pre-existence* of Christ, not merely in the foreknowledge of God, as the Jews conceived all important persons and things to pre-exist, or in the form of an ideal in heaven answering to an imperfect earthly reality, in accordance with the Greek way of thinking, but as a moral personality capable of forming a conscious purpose.¹

This great thought finds classic expression in the Epistle to the Philippians,² as to the authenticity of which little doubt exists even among the freest critical enquirers. But we do not need to go outside the four great epistles for traces of the idea. It is plainly hinted at in the words: "Ye know the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor."³ Nothing more than a hint is needed, for in view of the apostle's doctrine of redemption, the conception of a great Personality, high in dignity but lowly and gracious in spirit, freely resolving to enter into a state of humiliation on earth, almost goes without saying. It is what we expect, and it does not require a multitude of very explicit texts to overcome scepticism and convince us that it really entered into the Pauline system of thought.

This conception of the pre-existent Christ immediately raises other questions. In what relation does this Being who humbled Himself stand to man, to the universe, and to God? Materials bearing on all these topics may be

¹ On the difference between the Pauline idea of pre-existence and the notions entertained by Jews and Greeks, *vide* Harnack's *Dogmengeschichte*, vol. i. pp. 710-719, consisting of an Appendix on the idea of pre-existence. For the religious value of St. Paul's view on this point *vide* Weizsäcker's *Apostolic Age*, p. 146. Neither of these writers has any doubt that Paul believed in and taught the pre-existence of Christ.

² Chap. ii. 5-9.

³ 2 Cor. viii. 9.

found in the letters which form the chief basis of our study.

1. The apostle says that Christ was made of a woman,¹ and that He was sent into the world in the likeness of sinful flesh.² That is, He came into the world by birth, like other men, and He bore to the eye the aspect of any ordinary man. But though Christ came in the likeness of the flesh of sin, He was not, according to the apostle, a sinner. He "knew no sin"³ The mind that was in Him before He came ruled His life after He came. He walked in the spirit while on this earth, the Son of God according to the spirit of holiness. Yet St. Paul conceived of the resurrection as constituting an important crisis in the experience of Christ. Thereby He was declared to be, or constituted the Son of God with power. Thereafter He became altogether spiritual, even in His humanity, the *Man from heaven*.⁴ The expression suggests that Christ, as St. Paul conceived Him, was human even in the pre-existent state, so that while on earth he was the Man who had been in heaven, and whose destination it was to return thither again. This view would seem to imperil the reality of the earthly state as something inadequate, phantasmal, transitory, and a mere incident in the eternal life of a Being not of this world; not a true man, though "made in the likeness of men," and "found in fashion as a man."⁵ But the soteriological doctrine of the apostle demanded that Christ should be a real Man, and that His human experience should be in all respects as like ours as possible. Even in respect to the flesh of sin the likeness must be close enough to insure that Christ should have an experience of temptation sufficiently thorough to qualify Him for helping us to walk in the spirit.

Among the realistic elements in the Pauline conception of Christ's humanity may be reckoned the references to

¹ Gal. iv. 4.

² Rom. viii. 3.

³ 2 Cor. v. 21.

⁴ 1 Cor. xv. 47.

⁵ Phil. ii. 7-8.

the Jewish nationality and Davidic descent of our Lord. These occur in the Epistle to the Romans,¹ which is irenic in aim, and might therefore not unnaturally be regarded as indicating the desire to conciliate rather than the religious value they possessed for the writer's own mind. Such references are indeed not what we expect from the apostle. His interest was in the universal rather than in the particular, in the human race rather than in any one nation, even if it were the privileged people to which he Himself belonged. Then it is not easy to conceive of him as attaching vital importance to Davidic descent in the strict physical sense as an indispensable condition of Jesus being the Christ and the Saviour of the world. He rested his own claims to be an apostle on spiritual rather than on technical grounds, and we can imagine him holding that Jesus might be the Messiah though not of the seed of David, just as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews maintained that Jesus was a priest of the highest order though not belonging to the tribe of Levi. Instead of reasoning from Davidic descent to Messiahship, St. Paul might invert the argument and say: Because Christ, therefore David's seed; just as he said of believers in Christ: "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed";² "seed" in both cases being understood in an ideal not in a literal sense. But all the more just on that account it is significant that he does think it worth while to state that Jesus was "of the seed of David according to the flesh." It may be taken as indicating two things: that St. Paul believed in Christ's descent from David as a matter of fact, and that he regarded it as a fact of some interest. The statement occurs in a passage at the commencement of his most important epistle, in which he carefully indicates his Christological position, and it may therefore legitimately be regarded as counting for something in that position.

¹ *Rom.* ix. 5, i. 3.

² *Gal.* iii. 29.

Obviously the Divine Sonship is for him the main concern, but it does not follow that the other side is for him a thing of no moment. And wherein lies its value? Why say Christ is a Jew and a Son of David when stating a truth which eclipses these facts and reduces them apparently to utter insignificance, viz. that He is the Son of God? Because he desires to affirm the reality of Christ's humanity, not in an abstract form, but as a concrete, definitely-qualified thing: Jesus a real Man; a Jew with Hebrew blood in His veins, and possessing Hebrew idiosyncrasies, physical and mental; a descendant of David with hereditary qualities inherited from a long line of ancestors running back to the hero-king. Such seems to have been St. Paul's idea, and it is worth noting as a thing to be set over against any traces of apparent docetism in his epistles, and against the notion that he regarded Christ's earthly life in the flesh as possessing no permanent significance—a mere transitory phenomenon that might with advantage be forgotten.¹

Yet nationality and definite individuality, while not irrelevant trivialities, were far from being everything or the main thing for St. Paul. For the enthusiastic apostle of Gentile Christianity the universal relation of Christ to mankind was of much more importance than his particular relation to Israel or to David. And, as was to be expected, he had a name for the wider relation as well as for the narrower. The Son of David was for him, moreover and more emphatically, "the *second man*."² The title assigns to Christ a universal representative significance analogous to that of Adam. It is not merely a title of honour, but

¹ There is nothing decisive in the Pauline epistles concerning the miraculous birth of Christ. The expression *ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυεὶδ κατὰ σάρκα* might even be held to exclude it, except on the assumption that Mary, as well as Joseph, was of the line of David. If connection with David depended on Joseph only, Jesus might be more exactly described as Son of David *κατὰ νόμον* than *κατὰ σάρκα*. The expression *γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικὸς* fits into, but does not prove, birth from a virgin.

² *Cor.* xv. 47.

a title indicative of function. It points out Christ as one who has for His vocation to undo the mischief wrought by the transgression of the first man. Hence He is called in sharp antithesis to the Adam who caused the fall the last Adam made into a *quickening spirit*.¹ As the one brought death into the world, so the other brings life. "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive."²

2. That in a system of thought in which Christ stands in a vital relation to the whole human race He might also be conceived as occupying an important position in relation to the universe it is not difficult to believe. It is well known that in the Christological epistles ascribed to St. Paul, especially in the Epistle to the Colossians, a very high cosmic place is assigned to Christ. He is there represented as the first-born of all creation, nay, as the originator of the creation, as well as its final cause; all things in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, angels included, being made by Him and for Him.³ This goes beyond anything to be found in the four leading epistles. But even in these we find rudiments of a doctrine as to the cosmic relations of Christ which might easily develop into the full-blown Colossian thesis under appropriate conditions. For St. Paul, as for Jesus, it was an axiom that the universe had its final aim in the kingdom of God, or in Christ its King. This truth finds expression in several familiar texts, as when it is said: "All things work together for good to them that love God";⁴ or again, "All things are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's."⁵ The groaning of the creation in labour for the bringing forth of a new redeemed world is a graphic pictorial representation of the same great thought.⁶ It is only the complement of this doctrine that Christ should be represented as having the control of providence, or as the Mediator of God's

¹ *Cor.* xv. 45.² *Cor.* xv. 22.³ *Col.* i. 15, 16.⁴ *Rom.* viii. 28.⁵ *1 Cor.* iii. 23.⁶ *Rom.* viii. 22.

activity in the world. This is done when it is stated that God "hath put all things under His feet";¹ and still more explicitly in another text from the same Epistle, where Jesus Christ is described as the one Lord by whom, or on account of whom, are all things.² The reading varies here. If it were certain that $\delta\iota' \omicron\upsilon$ is the correct reading, we might find in this passage the doctrine of a mediatorial action of Christ in creation, and not merely in providence, while from the reading $\delta\iota' \acute{o}\nu$ the latter only can be inferred. But indeed, in any case, from providential power to creative is only one step. He who directs providence in some sense creates. He furnishes the divine reason for creation, and is the Logos if not the physical cause of the universe. And in this point of view the doctrine of Christ's creative activity is thoroughly congruous to the Christian faith, and altogether such as we might expect a man like St. Paul to teach. The *rationale* of that doctrine is not the idea of Divine transcendency which, in the interest of God's majesty, demands that all His action on and in the world be through intermediaries. It is rather an ethical conception of the universe which demands that all things shall exist and be maintained in being for a God-worthy purpose.

3. In passing to the question as to the relation of Christ to God as set forth in the Pauline epistles I remark that the titles most commonly applied to Christ by the apostle in his other epistles are just those we found in use in the Primer Epistles: the *Son of God* and the *Lord*!³ We find both combined in the Christological introduction to the Epistle to the Romans, where we have reason to believe the writer is expressing himself with the utmost care and deliberation: "His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord." If we enquire in what sense the former of the two titles is to be understood, another phrase occurring in the same place

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 27.

² 1 Cor. viii. 6.

³ Vide EXPOSITOR, January, 1893.

might lead us to conclude that the sonship of Jesus is ethical in its nature. The apostle represents Christ as from or after the resurrection declared or constituted the Son of God in power *according to the spirit of holiness*, as if to suggest that Jesus was always worthy to be called the Son of God because of the measure in which the Holy Spirit of God dwelt in Him, and that His claim to the title became doubly manifest after the resurrection, whereby God set His seal upon Him as the Holy One, and made such doubts about His character as had existed previous to His death for ever impossible. And unquestionably this is at least one most important element in St. Paul's conception of Christ's sonship: sonship based on community of spirit. It is a sonship of this nature He has in view when further on in the same Epistle He represents Christ, God's Son, as a type to which the objects of God's electing love are to be conformed, and as occupying among those who have been assimilated to the type the position of first-born among many brethren, that is a position of pre-eminence on a basis of generic identity.¹ Yet that there was something unique in Christ's sonship as St. Paul conceived it we might infer from the expression "His own son" occurring at the beginning of the same section of the Epistle in which the brotherhood of sons is spoken of.² "His own son," not merely the first begotten in a large family, but the only begotten in some sense. And this aspect of solitariness or uniqueness is even more strongly suggested in the text in 1 Thessalonians, in which Christians are described as waiting for God's Son from heaven.³ There is indeed no *ἐαυτοῦ* there to lend emphasis to the title. The emphasis comes from the juxtaposition of the title with words in which conversion to Christianity is made to consist in turning to the true God from *idols*.⁴

¹ Rom. viii. 29.

² Rom. viii. 3.

³ 1 Thess. i. 9.

⁴ 1 Thess. i. 10.

How significant the application to Jesus, in such a connection, of the title Son of God! Finally we may note, as pointing in the same direction, the statement in 2 *Corinthians* iv. 4, that Christ is the image of God,¹ taken along with that in *Romans* viii. 29, that the destiny of believers is to be conformed to the image of God's Son. The ideal for Christians is to bear the image of Christ; for Christ Himself is reserved the distinction of being the image of God. We are but the reflection of that in Him which is the direct radiance of God's glory (*ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης*), the copy of that which constitutes Him the express image of God's essence (*χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑπόστασεως*).

In an important passage in 1 *Corinthians* viii. the title *Lord* gains equal significance to that which *Son* bears in 1 *Thessalonians* i. 10, from its position in a similar context. In some cases, as already hinted, the title might be regarded as the generous ascription of religious honour to Christ as Redeemer proceeding from a heart too warm to be exact in its use of language. But in 1 *Corinthians* viii. St. Paul is thinking as well as feeling, and he is thinking on a difficult and delicate problem, viz. the place to be assigned to Christ in view of Pagan polytheism. In that connection he makes this statement, "For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or on earth, (as there are gods many and lords many,) yet to us there is one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto Him, and one Lord Jesus Christ through whom or for whom are all things and we through Him."² The apostle here sets one real *θεός* over against the many *θεοὶ λεγόμενοι* of Paganism, and one real Lord over against its *κύριοι πολλοί*. And one cannot fail to feel that the title Lord ascribed to Jesus in such a connection is charged with grave significance. It seems as if the apostle meant thereby to introduce Christ into the sphere of the truly divine, urged on thereto by the

¹ ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ.

² 1 *Cor.* viii. 5 and 6.

imperious exigencies of his religious faith, and against his prejudices as a Jew in favour of a strict abstract monotheism inherited from his forefathers. And the title Father attached to the name of God seems to suggest that He finds room for Christ within the Divine under the title Son.

From what we have now ascertained as to St. Paul's way of thinking concerning Christ it might seem to follow that he would have no hesitation in calling Christ God. Has he then done this in any of his epistles, more especially in those which are most certainly authentic? There is one passage in the Epistle to the Romans which, in the judgment of many, supplies a clear instance of the ascription to Christ of the title Θεός. It is the well-known text *Romans ix. 5*: ὧν οἱ πατέρες καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν. The construction of this sentence which most readily suggests itself, at least to minds familiar with the doctrine of Christ's divinity, is that which places a comma after σάρκα, and takes the following clause as a declaration concerning Christ that He is God over all, blessed for ever. Another arrangement and interpretation, however, are possible, viz, to put a full stop after σάρκα, and to regard the last clause as a doxology, or ascription of praise to God the supreme Ruler: May God who is over all be blessed for ever. Thus read, the text contains no ascription of deity to Christ. Here, it may be observed in passing, we have an instance showing how much may depend on punctuation, and what a serious defect from the point of view of a mechanical theory of inspiration is the absence of punctuation from the autograph text. In connection with so important a subject as the Person of Christ it would certainly have been a great advantage to have had from the apostle's own hand a carefully punctuated text. Had this existed, and had it been found to contain a sign of the value

of a comma after *σάρκα* it would have left little room for doubt that St. Paul meant to speak of Christ as God over all. As the case stands we are left to determine the question whether this was indeed his intention by other considerations, and at most we can arrive only at a probable conclusion on either side of the question. As was to be expected, the passage has given rise to an immense amount of discussion, in which of course exegesis has been to a considerable extent influenced by dogmatic bias. Into the history of the interpretation I cannot here enter; I cannot even attempt to state in detail the grounds on which the decision of the point at issue turns. Let it suffice to state that among the considerations which have been urged in support of the view that the claim refers to Christ are these: that whenever an ascription of blessing to God occurs in the Hebrew or Greek Scriptures *εὐλογητὸς* precedes *Θεὸς*, that if the clause in question were a doxology referring to God as distinct from Christ the *ὦν* would be superfluous, and that such a doxology coming in where the clause stands would be frigid and senseless. These and other arguments however have not been deemed unanswerable; and, on the whole, in spite of personal predilection, one is constrained, after perusal of learned monographs, to admit that the bearing of this famous text on the deity of Christ is by no means so certain as at one time he may have been disposed to think.¹

One other text of great importance in its bearing on Christ's relation to God may here be noticed. It is the

¹ Amongst the most thorough discussions of the passage may be mentioned the article on the Construction of *Romans ix. 5* by Prof. Ezra Abbott in the *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, 1882, which gives a very full account of the literature of the topic. Prof. Abbott distinguishes no fewer than seven different ways in which the text may be, and has been punctuated and interpreted. Among the orthodox theologians who have pronounced against the reference to Christ may be named Dr. Agar Beet. *Vide* his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, p. 271.

benediction at the close of the second Epistle to the Corinthians: *Ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, μετὰ πάντων.* We have here a Trinity, not however to be forthwith identified with that of the formula framed by the council of Nice. The apostolic benediction does not run as a dogmatic theologian having in view the interests of Trinitarianism might desire. Dogmatic bias would suggest at least two changes: the transposition of the first two clauses, and the addition of the word *πατρός* after *Θεοῦ*, lest the use of the latter term absolutely should seem to imply that Christ while Lord was not God. Yet, notwithstanding these peculiarities—defects they might be called from the dogmatic point of view—this benediction of St. Paul implies surely a very high conception of Christ's person and position. One would say that he could hardly have used such a collocation of phrases as the grace of the Lord Jesus, the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, unless Christ had been for him a Divine being—God. All the three Beings named in the sentence must possess in common Divine nature. The second and third certainly do. It has been questioned whether for St. Paul the Holy Spirit was a Divine *Person*, or merely a Divine *Power*, but he was certainly either the one or the other. The Holy Spirit, if not a distinct Person in the Godhead, was at least God's—God's energy, therefore practically a synonym for God. What then are we to think but that the Lord Jesus being named together with God and the energy of God, as a source of blessing, is also God, and that all the three august Beings here spoken of are bound together by the tie of a common Divine nature?

While this appears to be the just interpretation of the apostolic benediction, it must be owned that in the Pauline epistles a certain position of subordination seems to be assigned to Christ in relation to God. The most outstanding text in this connection is that in 1 Cor. xv. 28, where

the winding up of the drama of redemption is made to consist in the resignation by the Son of God of His mediatorial power into the hands of His Father, that God may be all in all. This is one of those grand comprehensive statements with which the apostle is wont to conclude important trains of thought. Like all other statements of the same type, it rises to the oratorical sublime; but while inspiring awe it leaves us in doubt. The spoken word makes us feel how much is unspoken. We are taken in spirit to the outermost circle of revelation, whence we descry all around an infinite extent of darkness.

A. B. BRUCE.

LOVE THE LAW OF SPIRITUAL GRAVITATION.

“THIS is My commandment,” said Jesus, “that ye love one another as I have loved you”; “Every particle of matter in the universe,” said Newton, “attracts every other particle with a force directly proportioned to the mass of the attracting particle, and inversely to the square of the distance,” are the two monumental deliverances in human knowledge, and the Law of Love in the sphere of metaphysics is the analogue of the law of gravitation in the sphere of physics. The measure of ignorance in Science has been isolation when nature appears a series of unconnected departments. The measure of ignorance in Religion has been selfishness when the Race appears a certain number of individuals fighting each for his own hand. The master achievement of knowledge has been the discovery of unity. Before Newton, gravitation was holding the world together; it was his honour to formulate the law. Before Jesus, Love was preventing the dissolution of the Race; it was His glory to dictate the law. Newton found a number of fragments and left a physical universe. Jesus

found a multitude of individuals and created a spiritual kingdom. The advance from a congeries of individuals to an organized society is marked by four milestones. First, we are simply conscious of other men and accept the fact of their existence; we realize our mutual dependence and come to a working agreement. This is the infancy of the Race and conscience is not yet awake. Then we discover that there are certain things one must not do to his neighbour and certain services one may expect from his neighbour, that to injure the next man is misery and to help him is happiness. This is the childhood of the Race, and conscience now asserts itself. Afterwards we begin to review the situation and to collect our various duties: we arrange them under heads and state them in black and white. This is the youth of the Race, and reason is now in action. Finally, we take up our list of black and white rules and try to settle their connection. Is it not possible to trace them all to one root and comprehend them in one act? What a light to conscience, a relief to reason, a joy to the heart! This is the mature manhood of the Race, and the heart is now in evidence. From an instinct to duties, from duties to rules, and now from rules to Law. State that Law and the Race becomes one society.

Jesus came at a point of departure; He received the race from Moses and led it into liberty. The Jew of Jesus' day was, in spite of all his limitations, the most spiritual man in the world, and the more thoughtful Jews were sick of a code and thirsting for a principle. "Master," said a scribe to Jesus, "which is the great commandment in the law?" (St. Matt. xxii. 36), and this anonymous seeker after truth has suffered unjust reproach. He has been imagined a mere pedant held in the bonds of a vain theology, or a cunning sophist anxious to entrap Jesus into a war of words. He ought rather to be thought of as an earnest

student whose mind had outgrown a worn-out system, and who was waiting for the new order. His desire was not a puerile comparison of rules; he had tasted the tedium of such debates in Pharisaic circles: his desire was to get from the branches to the root. He believed that Jesus had made the discovery. Jesus recognised a congenial mind and placed a generous interpretation on the scribe's words, "Thou art not far," He said, "from the kingdom of God." (St. Mark xii. 34.)

Jesus addressed Himself to the unity of moral law in His first great public utterance, and only concluded His treatment before His arrest in the garden. His sermon on the mount was a luminous and comprehensive investigation of the ten words with a purpose—to detect their spiritual source and organic connection. It was the analysis of a code in order to identify the principle. It was the experimental search for a law conducted with every circumstance of spiritual interest before a select audience; it was a sustained suggestion by a score of illustrations that the law had been found. Moses said, "do this or do that." Jesus refrained from regulations—He proposed that we should love. Jesus, while hardly mentioning the word, planted the idea in His disciples' minds, that Love was Law. For three years He exhibited and enforced Love as the principle of life, until, before he died, they understood that all duty to God and man was summed up in Love. Progress in the moral world is ever from complexity to simplicity. First one hundred duties; afterwards they are gathered into ten commandments; then they are reduced to two: love of God and love of man (St. Mark xii. 30, 31); and, finally, Jesus says His last word: "This is My commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you (St. John xv. 12).

When Jesus proposes to sum up the whole duty of man in Love, one is instantly charmed with the sentiment and understands how it made the arid legalism of the scribes to

blossom like the rose. How can one conquer sin? How can one come to perfection? How can one have fellowship with God? How can one save the world? And to a hundred questions of this kind Jesus has one answer: "Love the man next you." It is the poetry of idealism; it is quite beyond criticism as a counsel of perfection. But we are haunted with the feeling that this is not a serious treatment of the subject. We are inclined to turn from the Galilean dreamer and fall back on the casuists. It is one of our limitations to imagine that poetry is something less than truth instead of its only adequate expression, and that the heart is an impulsive child whose vagaries have to be checked instead of the imperial power in human nature. We are redeemed by the inspiration of Jesus. Had Jesus repeated the hackneyed programme of negation with a table of "shalt nots," He would have afforded another dreary instance of moral failure. When Jesus published His positive principle of Love, and left each man to draw up his own table, He gave a brilliant pledge of spiritual success. By this magical word of Love He not only brought the dry bones together and made a unity; He clothed them with flesh and made a living body. He may have forfeited the name of moralist, He has gained the name of Saviour.

Jesus was not an agreeable sentimentalist who imagined that He could cleanse the world by rose-water; He was the only thinker who grasped the whole situation root and branch. He did not propose to make sin illegal; that had been done without conspicuous benefit. He proposed to make sin impossible by replacing it with love. If sin be an act of self-will, each person making himself the centre, then Love is the destruction of sin, because Love connects instead of isolating. No one can be envious, avaricious, hard-hearted, no one can be gross, sensual, unclean, if he loves. Love is the death of all bitter and unholy moods of the soul, because Love lifts the man out of himself and teaches

him to live in another. Jesus did not think it needful to eulogise the virtues : it would have been a work of supererogation when He had insisted on Love. It is bathos, for instance, to instruct a mother in tenderness and care ; the instinct will fulfil itself. Jesus has changed ethics from a crystal that can only grow by accretion into a living plant that flowers in its season. He exposed the negative principle of morals in His empty house swept and garnished ; He vindicated the positive principle in His house held by a strong man armed (St. Luke xi. 21-26). The individualism of selfishness is the disintegrating force which has cursed this world, segregating the individual and rending society to pieces. The altruism of Love is the consolidating force which will save the world, reconciling every man to his fellows and recreating society. When Jesus makes Love the basis of social life, He does not need to condescend to details ; He has established unity.

When Jesus gave His doctrine of Love in its final form, one is struck by a startling omission. He laid on His disciples the repeated charge of Love to one another (St. John xiii. 34, 35 ; xv. 12, 13), He did not once command them to love God. While His preachers have in the main exhorted men to love God, Jesus in the main exhorted them to love their fellow-men. This was not an accident—a bias given to His mind by the immense suffering in the world : it was an intention—the revelation of Jesus' idea of Love. Conventional religion divides love into provinces—natural love ; ranging from the interest of a philanthropist in the poor to the passion of a mother for her child and spiritual love, whose humblest form is the fellowship of the Christian Church and whose highest is the devotion of the soul to God. This artifice is the outcome of a limited vision ; it has been punished by a contracted heart. It has ended in the disparagement of natural love and the unreality of spiritual love. Jesus never once sanctioned this

mischievous distinction: He bitterly satirises its effect on conduct. The Pharisee offers to God the gift which ought to have gone to his parents' support—so devoted was he to God, so lifted above ordinary affection (St. Mark vii. 11). Our Master accepted the solidarity of sin, that no one could injure a fellow-creature without hurting God. "If the world hate you, ye know that it hated Me before it hated you"; and "He that hateth Me, hateth My Father also (St. John xv. 18, 23). He accepted with as little reserve the solidarity of Love—that no one could love a fellow-creature with a pure, unselfish passion without loving God. "He that receiveth you receiveth Me, and he that receiveth Me receiveth Him that sent Me" (St. Matt. x. 40). As St. John has it, with an echo of past words, "Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God" (1 Epist. St. John iv. 7). Life is the school of love, in which we rise from love of mother and wife and child through a long discipline of sacrifice to the love of God. Love is the law of Love.

It was the habit of Jesus' mind to trace the seen at every point into the unseen, and He gave the law of Love its widest and farthest range. He was not content with insisting that the unity of the human stood in Love, He suggested that Love was also the unity of the Divine. The same bond that made one fellowship of St. John and St. Peter was the principle of communion between the Father and the Son. With Jesus the Trinity was never a metaphysical conception—a state of being; it was an ethical fact—a state of feeling. It was a relation of Love which found its life in sacrifice. As the Father gave the Son, so the Son gave Himself, and as the Son gave Himself, so must His disciples give themselves for the brethren. God and Christ were one in love; Christ and man were one in love. The great Law had full course, and God and man were united in the sacrifice of love. "Therefore doth my Father

love Me, because I lay down My life that I might take it again. This commandment have I received of My Father" (St. John x. 17, 18). "This is My commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you" (St. John xv. 12). "If ye keep My commandments, ye shall abide in My love; even as I have kept My Father's commandments and abide in His love" (St. John xv. 10). "If a man love Me, he will keep My words: and My Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him" (St. John xiv. 23). Perhaps the most profound symbol of Jesus was the washing of the disciples' feet, and therefore the preamble of St. John, "knowing . . . that He was come from God and went to God." It seemed only an act of lowly and kindly service; it really was an illustration of the Law which holds in one God Almighty and the meanest man who is inhabited by Jesus' Spirit.

Apart from the Incarnation, which is the theoretical ground of a united humanity, and His Spirit, which is the practical influence working towards that high end, Jesus made two contributions to the cause of unity. He has stated in convincing terms the principle which alone can repair the disruption in society and close its fissures. What rends society in every land is the conflict between the rights of the one and the rights of the many, and harmony can only be established by their reconciliation. Peace can never be made by the suppression of the individual—which is collectivism, nor by the endless sacrifice of a hundred for the profit of one—which is individualism. Jesus came to bring each man's individuality to perfection, not to sink him in the mass. Jesus came to rescue the poor and weak from the tyranny of power and ambition, not to leave them in bondage. Both ends were His, and both are embraced in His new commandment. For the ideal placed before each individual is not rule but service, and in proportion to his attainments will be his sacrifices. By one stroke Jesus secures

the welfare of the many who share in the success of the one, and the sanctification of the one whose character is developed by his service of the many. It will not be necessary to cripple any man's power lest it may be a menace to his neighbours, because it will be their voluntary servant, nor will his neighbours be driven to the vice of oppression because they will not fear. Where Jesus' idea prevails a rivalry of service will be the habit of society, and he will stand highest who stoops lowest in the new order of life.

Jesus also offered in the Church a model of the perfect society, and therefore He established the Church on an eternal and universal principle. Wherever a number of isolated individuals come together and form one body there must be some bond of unity. With a nation it is geography—the people live within certain degrees of latitude. With a party it is opinion—its members bind themselves for a common end. With a firm it is business—its partners trade in the same article. Jesus contemplated a society the most comprehensive and intense, the most elastic and cohesive in history, which would embrace all countries, suit all times, cultivate all varieties, fulfil all aspirations. It was the ambition of Jesus as the Son of Man, and this was the question before His mind: What delicate and pervasive moral system could bind into one the diverse multitude that would call Him Lord, so that I—some obscure nineteenth century Christian—may feel at home in St. Paul's Cathedral, or at St. Peter's, Rome, or in the Metropolitan Church of Athens, or at a Salvation Army meeting? This were indeed an irresistible illustration of spiritual communion and a prophecy of the unity of the Race. "I belong," said Angelique, the Abbess of Port Royal, "to the order of all the saints, and all the saints belong to my order." What is the bond of this mystical order? Jesus stated and vindicated it in the upper room.

It is the fond imagination of many pious minds that the

basis of spiritual unity must lie in the reason and stand in uniformity of doctrine. This unfortunate idea has been the poisoned spring of all the dissensions that have torn Christ's body from the day when Eastern Christians fought in the streets about His Divinity to the long years when Europe was drenched in blood about His lovely Sacraments. It is surely a very ghastly irony that the immense sorrow of the world has been infinitely increased by the fierce distractions of that society which Jesus intended to be the peacemaker, and that Christian divisions should have arisen from the vain effort after an ideal Jesus never once had within His vision. With St. John and St. Thomas, Matthew the publican and Simon the zealot at the same Holy Table, it is not likely that Jesus expected one model of thought: with His profound respect for the individual and His sense of the variety of truth, it is certain He did not desire it.

Jesus realized that the tie which binds men together in life is not forged in the intellect but in the heart. Behind nations and parties, behind all the divisions and entanglements of society stands the family. Love is the first and the last and the strongest bond in experience. It conquers distance, outlives all changes, bears the strain of the most diverse opinions. What a proof of Jesus' divine insight that He did not make His Church a school—whether of the Temple or the Poreh—but a family: did not demand in His farewell that His disciples should think alike, but that they should feel alike! He believed it possible to bind men to their fellows on the one condition that they were first bound fast to Him. He made Himself the centre of eleven men, each an independent unit; He sent through their hearts the electric flash of His love and they became one. It was an experiment on a small scale; it proved a principle that has no limits. Unity is possible wherever the current of love runs from Christ's heart through human hearts and back to Christ again, None is cast out unless he refuse

to love: no one is isolated unless he be non-conducting. Within the Church visible, with its wearisome forms and hideous controversies, lives the Church invisible, the communion of love, and its spirit is a perpetual witness to Christ's mission of atonement: "That they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me" (St. John xvii. 21).

Whenever doctrine and Love have entered the lists, not as friends but as rivals, Love has always won and so confirmed the wisdom of Jesus. He has had servants in every country distinguished for their devout spirit and controversial ability. Their generation crowned them for their zeal against heresy, but succeeding generations conferred a worthier immortality. The Church forgot their polemics, she kept their hymns. Bernard of Clairvaux, depopulated Europe in order to conquer the Holy Land with the sword for Him who preached peace throughout its borders; but we only remember the saint who wrote:

"Jesus, Thou joy of loving hearts."

Toplady divided his time between composing hymns instinct with love, and assailing John Wesley with incredible insolence. His acrimonious defence of the Divine Sovereignty is buried and will never be disinterred, but while the Church lasts she will sing

"Rock of ages, cleft for me."

Rutherford, of St. Andrew's, laboured books of prodigious learning against Prelacy, and the dust lies heavy upon them this day, but the letters he wrote in his prison on the love of Christ have been the delight of Scottish mystics for two centuries. If any one feels compelled to attack a religious neighbour, his contemporaries may call him faithful, his successors will endeavour to forget him. If any one can worthily express the devotion of Christian hearts, his words

will pass into the heritage of Christendom. What is not of love, dies almost as soon as it is born: what is of love, lives for ever. It has the sanction of Eternal Law; it has in it the breath of immortality.

The Christian consciousness grows slowly into the mind of Jesus. First it clings to legalism with St. Peter; afterwards it learns faith with St. Paul; it enters at last into love with St. John, the final interpreter of Jesus. We are now in the school of St. John, and are beginning to discover that none can be a heretic who loves, nor any one be other than a schismatic who does not love. None can be cast out of God's kingdom if he loves, none received into it if he does not love. Usher could not ex-communicate Rutherford because he was not ordained by a Bishop, nor Rutherford condemn Usher because he was a head and front of Prelacy. Channing cannot exclude Faber because he believes too much, or Faber exclude Channing because he believes too little. None can read Jesus' exposition of Love and imagine such moral disorder. It would be the suspension of spiritual gravitation. We are protected from one another by the Magna Charta of the kingdom: we are under a Law that has no regard to our prejudices. He that loves is blessed; he that hates is cursed—is the action of an automatic law. It is the very condition of the spiritual world, which is held together by Love: it is the very nature of God Himself, who is Love.

“ I'm apt to think the man
That could surround the sum of things and spy
The heart of God and secrets of His Empire
Would speak but love, with him the bright result
Would change the hue of intermediate scenes
And make one thing of all Theology.

JOHN WATSON.

PROFESSOR DRUMMOND'S "ASCENT OF MAN."

A DIFFICULTY which will not improbably present itself to many minds on reading Professor Drummond's new book is that arising from the more or less unconscious effort of the reader to decide from what standpoint the book as a whole should be viewed. It is in many respects a book which arrests attention. There is a ring of greatness about it. The author has chosen the noblest of all subjects, and not only has he, on the whole, risen to the level of it, but the inspiration is felt to be so sustained that, even where he at times falls below it, the reader is always sure that he will rise again. This will perhaps be generally admitted. Yet it is not unlikely that some who do not succeed in focussing it properly, will feel that there is also an element of disappointment in it. The fact is that, although the book deals with scientific questions, its subject is not so much science as the poetry of science. It represents the soaring flights of a young and vigorous school of thought, which often rises into regions where the captive wing of science can almost certainly never hope to follow. But, like all true poetry, it has its justification. Even in its most daring generalizations there is an element of truth capable of commending itself to the soberest minds.

If this preliminary reservation may be allowed, it is possible to appreciate Professor Drummond's finely written book. The first three chapters take us up to the "Dawn of Mind," and their subject matter is indicated by their titles. They are, "The Ascent of the Body," "The Scaffolding left in the Body," and "The Arrest of the Body." They deal with the evolution of the human body from lower forms of life, with the numerous evidences of its ancestry it still retains—all of which are effectively recapitulated in a manner calculated to strike the general imagination—and, finally,

with the arrested development and degeneration of those organs and qualities in the body which reached their highest usefulness in the struggle for existence on a lower plane. Much of what is characteristic in these chapters, and also to some extent in the book as a whole, will be familiar to those who have read Fiske's *Destiny of Man*. It is hardly possible to discuss the theories themselves in a severely critical spirit. Their full acceptance would require assent to much that science can only take with reservation and qualification, and to do justice to the chapters they must be judged rather by the general effect they produce on the mind. They contain many fine passages. Many who have burnt the midnight oil watching for hours the development beneath the microscope of the embryo of frog, or fish, or insect, will realize that the author has for them often brought thought to birth in words in these chapters. Those wonderful fleeting structures, so often developed for a few hours to again pass and disappear as in the short span of a single summer night, the developing embryo dimly recapitulates the life history of its kind through measureless changing epochs in the past, and in unknown times and climates, all tell a story of the past history of life on our planet, the depth and range of which even the highest poetry has yet failed to compass. Professor Drummond makes us realize this in a high degree of the human body. As he well remarks (pp. 94-5) :—

“He who ponders over the more ancient temple of the Human Body will find imagination fail him as he tries to think from what remote and mingled sources, from what lands, seas, climates, atmospheres, its various parts have been called together, and by what innumerable contributory creatures, swimming, creeping, flying, climbing, each of its several members was wrought and perfected. What ancient chisel first sculptured the rounded column of the limbs? What dead hands built the cupola of the brain, and from what older ruins were the scattered pieces of its mosaic-work brought? Who fixed the windows in its upper walls? What winds and weathers wrought strength into

its buttresses? What ocean-beds and forest-glades worked up its colourings? What Love and Terror and Night called forth the Music? And what Life and Death and Pain and Struggle put all together in the noiseless workshop of the past, and removed each worker silently when its work was done."

Haeckel in a striking passage once called attention to what must be the infinite and inconceivable delicacy of the albuminous matter comprising the single cell of microscopic dimensions in which all the higher forms of life originate—a simple cell capable of transmitting the molecular individual vital motion of the form of life it represents so accurately that afterwards the minutest bodily and mental peculiarities of the parents reappear in new life. Professor Drummond follows up and develops the same idea in a fine passage (pp. 95-6):—

"Recall the vast antiquity of that primal cell, from which the human embryo first sets forth. Compass the nature of the potentialities stored up in its plastic substance. Watch all the busy processes, the multiplying energies, the mystifying transitions, the inexplicable chemistry of this living laboratory. Observe the variety and intricacy of its metamorphoses, the exquisite gradation of its ascent, the unerring aim with which the one type unfolds—never pausing, never uncertain of its direction, refusing arrest at intermediate forms, passing on to its flawless maturity without waste or effort or fatigue. See the sense of motion at every turn, of purpose and of aspiration. Discover how, with identity of process and loyalty to the type, a hair-breadth of deviation is yet secured to each, so that no two forms come out the same, but each arises an original creation, with features, characteristics and individualities of its own."

All this every biologist who knows and understands his subject must have felt, even while he may have known it to be beyond his power to convey the feeling to others in words like these.

It is to be doubted, perhaps, whether the highest value of some of Professor Drummond's most characteristic theories does not consist merely in their suggestiveness. The theory, borrowed from Fiske, that in the human body

we have the highest possible product of organic evolution, and that therein the development of the vertebrate form has reached its limit, is one which, if we mistake not, few representatives of science will be willing to unreservedly accept. The author's views also respecting the degeneration of the body are, it would appear, carried much too far. His own argument leaves an uncomfortable feeling on the mind of even the uncritical reader that it has proved too much. Our waning powers of sight, our degraded ears, our inefficient skin, our degenerating teeth and jaws, are all most mercilessly exposed to an audience whose sympathies are reserved in advance for the superior creature with the expanding brain. But in this glorification of the intellect at the expense of the body Professor Drummond appears to be on rather doubtful ground. What *is* taking place would seem to be merely the adjustment of the body to changing conditions of life. Similar adjustments are always in progress in all the higher forms of life; some parts are always undergoing degeneration, while others are in like manner being progressively developed. But it is easy to imagine what Professor Drummond's probable reception would be if it were to be in his power to produce to a class of Scotch students a genuine representative of the primeval savage type with over-developed stomach, low stature, and weak, bandy legs, and then to point to his audience as examples of degraded bodily development from this standard. The Scotch, with the English professional classes, enjoy, as Mr. Galton has shown, a position almost at the head of the race list in height development, while the Australian Bushman is at the bottom with an average of 4 ft. 4.78 in. In weight and chest measurement also the races that are winning most ascendancy in the world to-day are well to the fore. In the stress and strain of life vigorous physical qualities are too closely associated with vigorous mental qualities to be thus sharply contrasted.

Besides, they are both subordinate to, and influenced by, larger considerations of ethical development, which are not mentioned. The gilded youth of Rome who jested and quoted Horace to each other while they pinched and patted the muscles of the Northern gladiators, on whom they had laid their bets, considered themselves vastly superior creatures to the mere barbarian who made their sport. But it is the Northern barbarian who rules the world now.

The fourth chapter in Professor Drummond's book is entitled "The Dawn of Mind." It is probably one of the least satisfactory in the book. Like so many others who have come into contact with uncivilized man, the author follows in an old and beaten track which it is high time we had abandoned. He is apparently ready to regard the immense interval which separates us from savage man as a result arising from his greatly inferior mental development, instead of from a lack of those qualities which contribute to social efficiency and the possession of which enable the higher races to develop stable civilizations and to store up knowledge of the arts and sciences. There is abundant evidence now-a-days to show that the children of uncivilized races, when brought up under the same conditions as European children, labour under no intellectual disability of a kind to prevent them from acquiring knowledge and learning with much the same facility as the children of the higher races. The intellectual interval between uncivilized man of the present day and the higher races is, in fact, comparatively small and insignificant compared with the enormous difference which must separate the minds of even the lowest savages from the earliest type of intelligence. Yet Professor Drummond innocently looks round the world and sees that the mind of man "exists to-day, among certain tribes at almost the lowest point of development with which the word human can be associated; and that from that point

an Ascent of Mind can be traced from tribe to nation in an ever-increasing complexity and through infinitely delicate shades of improvement, till the highest civilized states are reached." Surely this betokens a state of mind in the author peculiar to an earlier stage of knowledge on this subject. He tells us further, that "in the very nature of things we should have expected such a result."

But the facts with which he supports these curious statements are something like the fabled dragon's teeth. For under the critical eye the arguments they suggest tend to rise up and annihilate each other so far as their support to his case goes. The descendants of the benighted cannibals of the Sandwich Islands who a century ago killed and ate Captain Cook, are already, he is compelled to admit, claiming to be admitted among civilized nations. A few pages on he tells us very effectively of the immense part which language has played in banking the experience of the race and in thus immeasurably widening the distance between man and the animal. But all the time he appears to be oblivious to the equally important and exactly similar part which a state of social stability (resulting from the possession of qualities contributing to social efficiency) has played in banking the gains of knowledge and in similarly widening the interval between civilized man and the savage. It is only when we understand the difference between civilized and uncivilized man to be, in the largest sense, the result, not of great intellectual inferiority but of an environment arising directly from his lack of qualities contributing to social efficiency, that we perceive the true bearing of the passage from Mr. Herbert Spencer, with which the author completes the destruction of his argument.

"It needs but to ask what would happen to ourselves were the whole mass of existing knowledge obliterated, and were children with nothing beyond their necessary language left to grow up without guidance or instruction from adults, to perceive that even now the higher intellec-

tual faculties would be almost inoperative from lack of the materials and aids accumulated by past civilizations. And seeing this, we cannot fail to see that development of the higher intellectual facilities has gone on *pari passu* with social advance alike as cause and consequence; that the primitive man could not evolve these higher intellectual faculties in the absence of a fit environment, and that in this as in other respects his progress was retarded by the absence of capacities which only progress could bring."

The latter half of Professor Drummond's book is devoted to the treatment of subjects connected with the development upwards throughout life of the altruistic and social qualities which reach their fullest expression in human society. This part of the book seems on the whole inferior to the first part. It is full of fine passages; but the attentive reader will nevertheless feel keenly that he misses something. The author somehow fails to secure his entire confidence. There is often an evident straining after effect; on the whole there is a scarcely concealed desire to hurry the reader on anyhow to a preconceived moral conclusion—that fault which so often does violence to the best intentions in a lower class of literature, even when the reader's entire sympathies are with the author. It has other faults too. A reader fully acquainted with the facts with which Professor Drummond is dealing can scarcely avoid feeling that the author himself lacks to some extent that firm grasp of the main principles underlying the facts which we have a right to expect from him. For instance, it soon becomes apparent that he has confused throughout, and mingled in inextricable entanglement in these pages, the facts connected with two totally distinct developments in life, namely, the parental development and the co-operative or social development. In the parental development he has a splendid subject, but this want of grasp renders the treatment disappointingly inadequate.

Every evolutionist who has made progress towards understanding his subject should have firmly fixed in his

mind the first principles of this parental development whatever else he may lack. Even a few bold strokes give an outline of a striking process of progress which has the directest connection with the highest ethical problems of human life, and into which an immense sequence of facts are seen to be fitted in simple and orderly relationship. We have at the bottom the institution of sex, the enormous physiological import of which—despite the author's doubts—science is beginning to clearly understand. But fertilization can only take place in the single cell stage of every organism. Observe, therefore, the results of this exacting condition to which life is thus subjected almost from the beginning, and the ascending series of phenomena of extraordinary interest to which it gives rise. We have on the one side the organism itself ever growing more and more complex as progress continues to be made upwards to higher forms of life. On the other hand, we have, notwithstanding this, the necessity imposed on nature of returning for every new life to exactly the same starting point as at the beginning—the single cell. The effort to bridge in the most efficient manner the enormous and ever-lengthening interval of helplessness between these two extremes—the single cell stage and the complex adult individual—is, therefore, the key to all the ascending phenomena of parenthood. It has provided the battle-ground of genera and species and types of life in one of the greatest and most persistent struggles in the history of life. In the birds and their eggs we have the culminating stage reached in one line of effort. In the mammalia another line of yet greater possibilities is opened up; the developing embryo is withdrawn altogether from the risks of a separate existence in the egg; it draws sustenance direct from the mother; the young reaches a more and more advanced stage of development before being born as we rise from the marsupials to the placentals; the parental instincts

become greatly developed ; the burthen of parenthood grows ever heavier, and the necessity for bearing it efficiently more imperative as the creature grows more complex and the distance between the two extremes continues to be lengthened out, till the climax is at length attained in man in whom the deepening of the parental feelings and the enormous prolongation of the period of infancy paves the way for the first beginnings of the social state. Altogether we have in this development the outlines of a vast connected process the interest and significance of which dominates the whole story of life.

But the treatment of so great a subject in the hands of so able a writer as Professor Drummond is not satisfactory. He begins naturally with the ethical significance of sex ; but after having excited the imagination by showing us "how deep from the very dawn of life this rent between the two sexes yawns," all he really brings us to is the somewhat inconsequent conclusion that "had sex done nothing more than make an interesting world, the debt of evolution to reproduction had been incalculable." In the long drawn out stage in which physiological necessity reduces the number of young, and higher equipment begins to take the place of numbers in the struggle for existence, Professor Drummond sees operating only the necessity for focussing the parental care on one so as to "concentrate it into love" and "to make it possible for the parent to recognise its young." The significant process by which the embryo ceased to be separated from the mother at an early stage, as in the eggs of reptiles and birds, and in which the connection during the always lengthening period of embryonic development grows ever closer as we rise in the mammals from the marsupials to the placentals, is explained by Professor Drummond in the same fanciful and disappointing way. It was all, we are told, "to make the children presentable at birth," so "that when first they caught the

mother's eye they were 'strong and of a good liking.'” And so on. Not till the author takes up Fiske's idea of the lengthening out of the period of infancy in man because of the time required for perfecting the more complex adult, and the influence of this fact in our social development, do we get any insight into the laws governing the development as a whole and the tremendous import of the process throughout; after which the author again relapses, and we see him at the previous level in the chapter on “the Evolution of a Father.”

It is while labouring under the disadvantage of having to feel that Professor Drummond has somehow failed him in these chapters as a guide in enabling him to see “in a plain way a few of the things which science is now seeing,” that the reader turns back in natural sequence to the introductory chapters, which were evidently written last. Here a much higher level of thought is reached, and both in these chapters and in the last chapter in the book we feel that we are again in the company of the author of *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*. But it is still necessary to use our own eyes, and walk cautiously with the author. Surely, for instance, the real *gravamen* of the indictment to which modern science has undoubtedly laid herself open in failing to give us a scientific explanation of our social and ethical development is not comprised in his charge that she has seen only the struggle for life, and has not considered the struggle for the life of others. Let Professor Drummond examine the accused, and deal fairly with her and he will see that it is not here that she has failed. Even the passages which he quotes from her spokesman in his own pages would be sufficient to produce the feeling that this cannot be so. The true cause of the failure has been quite different; it is one to which Professor Drummond himself often bears witness. It is that she has followed the method of regarding man and his social life as something

quite distinct and apart from the rest of Creation. If Professor Drummond will turn to Professor Huxley's Romanes Lecture, 1893,¹ he will see the cause of the failure written large therein. He will find the author there representing man's development and progress as the successful effort to arrest and suspend the cosmic process. The truth is just the reverse. It is the cosmic process that is everywhere triumphant even right down into the midst of our Western civilization and our modern life; and every phase and aspect of our development, social, political, ethical and religious, has its meaning to science only in regard to the furtherance of this process. This is where Professor Drummond himself seems to be so often following a false issue. The struggle for the life of others is not, as he seems at times to think, something apart and to which the struggle for life finally leads up. The contrary is the truth. The struggle for the life of others is only a phase of the eternal rivalry of life which has its cause in deep-seated physiological necessities from which we have no power to escape. The struggle for the life of others has no meaning for science apart from this larger rivalry. The latter is becoming regulated, raised, humanized, but always and ever more efficient and more imperative. Once it was physical only; now it is ethical, moral, religious; that is the meaning of the ascent. As Professor Drummond has himself well said in a passage in which he sees the truth—although it is contradictory to much that he has said elsewhere:—

“Hence it has been ordained that Life and Struggle, Health and Struggle, Growth and Struggle, Progress and Struggle, shall be linked together; that whatever the chances of misdirection, the apparent losses, the mysterious accompaniments of strife and pain, the Ascent of Man should be bound up with living. When it is remembered that, at a later day, Morality and Struggle, and even Religion and Struggle, are bound so closely that it is impossible to conceive them apart, the tremendous value of this principle . . . will be perceived.”

¹ *Evolution and Ethics.*

The writer of this Article does not think that it would be, on the whole, quite fair to Professor Drummond to attempt any lengthened criticism of the remarks on his own book, *Social Evolution*, contained in the last chapter in this section, seeing that, as we are told, the book was read only as the sheets of the *Ascent of Man* were almost in the press. To some extent the difficulty discussed appears to be one of terminology. Professor Drummond seems to feel it to be a serious cause of complaint against the argument developed in *Social Evolution* that our social development has been put on an *ultra-rational* basis. The writer must, however, plead "not guilty" to such a change in the sense in which Professor Drummond apparently intends it. The writer did not put it there, he merely found it there, where, as it appears to him, every close student of our social systems, our history, and even our systems of jurisprudence will ultimately find it—if only he is able to start with a mind free from prepossession, and to keep it free from confusion. All that has been attempted in this respect in *Social Evolution* is to explain in the light of modern science how it is part of the cosmic order of things that it has come to be there, why it has always been there, and why, if recent developments of the doctrine of evolution are to be accepted, the reasoning appears to have almost the cogency of mathematical demonstration that it must always remain there, and that the whole assault which a certain class of reasoners have directed against religion must in consequence prove to have been an attack upon an empty fort. It would be out of place to restate the argument here by which this view is supported. Nothing that has been said since the book has been published has led the writer to feel that he can usefully add anything to it, as it is developed in the book itself.

Professor Drummond's fear that the law of continuity would be put to confusion if such a conclusion were established appears to be groundless. The conflict between the

self-assertive reason of the individual and the forces that are making ultimately for the welfare of the race is itself apparently an inherent part of the law of progress. Otherwise the conflict would soon be suppressed. But its existence does not involve any idea of confusion. Order and progress are everywhere the results of such conflicting laws. The earth moves round the sun in obedience to the original centrifugal impetus. But the centripetal tendency is in constant conflict with this impetus. Yet no law is put to confusion; the result is the majestic progress of the earth round the sun for millions of ages and all the sequence of life on our planet. Life itself is, again, but the constant mean between two conflicting tendencies, anabolism and katabolism, and yet there is no confusion. Nay more, the masterly researches of Geddes and Thompson have revealed to us that the same eternal conflict of tendencies in the life of the individual cells themselves has been the probable basis upon which nature has reared the tremendous superstructure of sex, and all that this implies in the evolution of life. There is no confusion here—only the terms of a larger unity. And so, likewise, the law of continuity is not “put to confusion,” but maintained, because we find in the social organism, founded on a system of religious belief, that “throughout its existence there is maintained within it a conflict of two opposing forces; the disintegrating principle represented by the rational self-assertiveness of the individual units; the integrating principle represented by a religious belief, providing a sanction for social conduct, which is always of necessity ultra-rational, and the function of which is to secure in the stress of evolution the continual subordination of the interests of the individual units to the larger interests of the longer-lived social organism to which they belong.”¹

The great transforming lesson which modern science has

¹ *Social Evolution*, p. 102.

probably in its power to bring finally home to philosophy is that its province has limits, which may be strictly and scientifically defined, and that the definition of those limits leaves the capital problems of human life and human progress unsolved and insoluble from the point of view of individual rationalism. To the writer human society is now, and apparently always has been and always will be, founded on ultra-rational sanctions. To say so is not to utter a complaint which sounds "like a dirge." All efforts to place it on any other foundations must apparently, if the evolutionary science of our time is to be accepted, end in always bringing us back to that starting point to which so many past systems of philosophy have returned. We shall have to say of these problems—to quote words recently used by Mr. Arthur James Balfour—that after all "they come upon us with all the old insistence. They are restated but they are not solved."¹ *This* has been the dirge which has come sounding down through philosophy in the past. It is the result, as modern science appears to be about to indicate to us, of attempting a task which fundamental physiological conditions of life render impossible of accomplishment.

BENJAMIN KIDD.

¹ "A Criticism of Current Idealistic Theories," by A. J. Balfour. *Mind*, Oct., 1893.

ANGELS UNAWARES.

“Forget not to show love unto strangers : for thereby some have entertained angels unawares.”—*Heb.* xiii. 2.

THE history of the Hebrews is a long series of migrations and dispersions. Since their first pilgrim father crossed the Euphrates and became a stranger in a strange land, Abraham's children have endured exodus and exile so often that the figure of the Wandering Jew seems like a type of their scattered race.

Yet no people ever proved so cohesive in dispersion. In New Testament times the Hebrews abroad outnumbered those in Palestine ; but they were Hebrews still. In every city along the shores of the Midland Sea they formed a little Puritan colony, aloof from the heathen, but ready with welcome for the travelling merchant and hearing for the travelling teacher of their own faith and blood.

The early Church inherited this primitive bond of kinship and its tradition of hospitality. More than one Apostle enforces the duty of entertaining wayfarers who belong to the household of Christ. Moreover a Christian Jew was counted a renegade by his own countrymen ; the fact of his Christianity shut in his face those Ghetto doors which sheltered any orthodox Jewish pilgrim. So that the Hebrew disciples would appreciate the stress here laid upon showing love to brethren on a journey, who might specially need succour ; they would appreciate, too, the allusion to Abraham and Lot and Gideon and Manoah and Tobit, who had all entertained angels unawares. “Play the host generously,” says the writer, “and you may, perchance, harbour heavenly guests like theirs.”

Now such a precept certainly does not require the modern Christian to turn his home into a casual ward. Yet there remains a real sense in which we are still bound to show love to strangers, and in which we too may thereby welcome angels whom we least expect.

Our modern Protestant ideas about angels are curiously mixed. We borrow them mainly from Milton ; and they came down to him multifariously through Rabbinic legends, and Gnostic fancies, and Neoplatonic speculations, and scholastic disputes. The result belongs less to religion than to the mythology of poetry and art ;

yet we habitually read that mythology into the Bible. It is true indeed that our Lord Himself distinctly acknowledges the reality of these spiritual beings; but the functions of angels in Scripture almost overshadow their personality. The name stands for that which embodies to us either a manifestation or a message of the Most High; its two senses are not always distinguished, but together they cover the chief uses of the word in the Bible. An angel is some special form in which God speaks, or works, or shows Himself; it is an agent or an instrument that brings Him into touch with men. And this text teaches that any passing guest may prove an angel to us—may become a living medium of God's message, a personal channel of God's grace to our souls.

There were ancient nations who had only one word to mean both stranger and enemy: each new comer was treated as a foe until he proved himself a friend. And we are still often tempted to think evil of people before we have had time to test their goodness. Perhaps some plausible stranger has taken you in, and made you suspect all his tribe. Nothing sours the heart like being duped by those to whom your faith had imputed its own righteousness. After a few such trials you persuade yourself that the world at large is not fit to be trusted, and that every man must be considered a rogue until he has proved himself honest.

And yet no temper is less Christian than this spirit of general suspicion. Better trust ten times and be deceived, than suspect one soul unjustly. The love which Christ requires us to show to strangers is the love which thinketh no evil, which believeth all things and hopeth all things, which is sometimes betrayed but never in despair.

Yet modern Christians neglect this precept not so much because they are too suspicious as because they are too busy. In simpler times, when strangers came like single spies, it was not so difficult to seek them out and make them welcome. But in our congested civilization we jostle among battalions of unknown folk each day, and we put on, perforce, the armour of reserve. We have enough acquaintances already, so many that their mere number goes to dilute the quality of friendship. What man has more than a certain available maximum of spare thought and interest? Which of us has time to show any real love to the units in this bewildering crowd?

The social world finds its analogue in the physical. We are told that all material substance consists of the interaction of innumerable separate tiny atoms, which are always in swiftest motion, always clashing against each other, and making millions of impacts every second. And yet not one of these molecules is forgotten before God; and ye are of more value than many molecules. The Father of Spirits must surely guide and restrain the contacts and encounters of each human soul that He has made. It is no vague chance or blind destiny which brings strangers to our tent door. And therefore *we must cherish a certain reverence for the unexpected*: we must keep an open heart towards these unknown pilgrims whom God's election has sent across our path or settled in our camp. Every year, at any rate, some fresh strangers detach themselves from the dim mass, and definitely enter our service or our circle; and we count them as "new people" not yet properly known. Yet each one of them is a brother immortal, who inherits an equal share with us in God's solicitude. For each one of them Christ died. In each one of them the Holy Ghost is dwelling, and working, and striving. And each dullest stranger has his own heart-secrets of joy and bitterness, his inward shames and sacrifices which we cannot estimate, a hidden romance which we never guess, a coming destiny of which we never even dream. We simply do not know how much may be in him, how much he may become to us or may do for us, in the future.

There are measureless possibilities in a stranger. When Haroun Alraschid was Caliph, any strayed reveller in the streets of Baghdad might prove to be the Commander of the Faithful himself. We ought to discern under the face of each stranger the countenance of Christ Himself. Inasmuch as we show love to one of the least of them, we are showing love to Him. There is an apocryphal saying recorded of our Lord, "Never be joyful except when ye shall look upon your brother in love." And it holds true, even when the brother is a stranger. The happy spirit which can so regard him, brings you straightway into touch with him; it opens an avenue into his heart.

That stranger may need you more even than you need him; he may come as a claim on your pity, a call for your devotion, an opportunity for your service. God has sent this needy angel to rouse you out of sloth and ease and indulgence, to build again the broken altar for a sacrifice of yourself. "Are they not all minister-

ing spirits?" Nay, not all. God's angel is sometimes sent, not to minister to us, but to be ministered unto: so that we may win thereby the grace of those who give rather than receive.

We do it all unawares. We often grow half impatient of these strangers who require so much, and seem to bestow so little. The hospitable heart goes on to the end, unconscious how its most exacting guests were only the disguises of One who shall say at last, "I was a stranger, and ye took Me in."

Nothing on this earth is so pathetic as the way in which we miss the meaning of life; and when our blessings meet us, we pass by ignorantly on the other side. We *refuse them*, as we entertain them, *unawares*. Alas! for the grace we have lost without knowing it. We take our daily bread, unwittingly and unworthily, not discerning the Lord's body. We look for God in earthquake or in fire, not listening for the still small voice. It is written of certain angels, that "their countenances were like lightning": but it is not said that their voices were like thunder. Dante describes Beatrice's speech as being, like Cordelia's, *soft and low* "*con angelica voce.*" And often our messages most direct from heaven fall softly from children's lips, or are murmured in low tones of sorrow and sickness. God's messenger does not sound a trumpet or lift up his voice in the streets. Whoso hath ears to hear, let him keep silence for what the angels say.

"We are come unto an innumerable company of angels": this is the experience of the Christian. To him all the common order of life and its natural changes seem instinct with spiritual presences and powers. To him the glory and loveliness of the outward world are, as Newman says, "the waving of their garments, whose faces see God." The storms and calms of nature become vocal. "Some said, it thundered; others said, an angel spake to Him."

It is written again, "Jacob went on his way, and the angels of God met him." These wayside angels of circumstance still meet us, day by day, in homely garb and guise. But as we show them love, and welcome each daily event that happens as being a token to us of the will of God, we find that each carries its own secret and peculiar blessing. Concerning such trivial things, it may be said, "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones." The hands which it holds out to us are laden with perfect love.

As we are hospitable to God's daily messages and mercies, we

find ministers of grace compassing our path and our lying down. Verily He has given His angels charge concerning us: perchance, the angel of pain, to purify; or the angel of disappointment, to humble; or the angel of loss, to enrich. But all His angels work together for good to them that love Him.

T. H. DARLOW.

“THE JOY SET BEFORE HIM.”

“For the joy that was set before Him, He endured the cross, despising the shame, and hath sat down at the right hand of the throne of God.”—*Heb.* xii. 2.

WE read a great man's biography mainly to understand what kind of man he was. We try to get behind his titles and trappings, and to touch the man himself. We pass over the mere details and accidents in his career; we want to discover the ideas which inspired him, and the ambitions which controlled, to see into the passions and sorrows which struggled in his breast, and so to realize what it was that moved him along the path he trod.

And we read the New Testament amiss unless it teaches us something about the motives of Jesus Christ, unless it opens His inward life to our gaze, and makes us understand not only His words and deeds, but also, by help of these, what manner of man He Himself was. The sacred biography will profit us little, except as it admits us into the heart of the Son of Man, so that we sympathise with His feelings, and grasp His purpose, and rejoice with Him as He rejoices, and weep with Him as He weeps.

Now we are hindered from this sympathy with Christ's human experience, in part by our theological prejudices, and still more by our moral defects. For spiritual secrets are spiritually discerned; and we are not good enough to understand His goodness. We are not simple enough nor pure enough, to realize how simply pure and how purely simple His mind and His motives were. We cannot imagine a man so perfect that He could always obey His natural impulse, because His impulse was always right. Jesus Christ always did exactly what it was natural for Him to do. And half our explanations of His words and deeds miss the mark because they are so clumsy and far-fetched and elaborate and artificial. The truth about Him is generally so simple that we

are not child-like enough to take it in. Consider, for instance, His first miracle, when He was a guest at the marriage feast of one of His friends. Probably the bridegroom was a working man, perhaps one of the crew of Peter's boat, or, it may be, another young carpenter who had worked at the same bench with Jesus Himself. At that feast, whether from absence of forethought or presence of poverty, we read that "they wanted wine." And at once Christ supplied the need, so quickly and quietly that the guests themselves did not know what He had done. It was an act of pure and simple kindness. We need not invent cumbrous explanations of it. He would not let His friend sit ashamed and confused because the wine had run short on his wedding day.

And I believe that the motives which prompted most of our Lord's miracles were just as simple and natural. They were not performed as portents, or carefully calculated to impress the bystanders; He wrought them out of pure pity, because He felt the same impulse of compassion that we feel when we come face to face with distress. Only, with Him, the wish to help and the power to help went hand in hand. Christ went about doing good just because it was natural to Him, because He loved to do it. He enjoined silence on so many whom He healed, from the same instinct which makes every modest man unwilling that his left hand should know what his right hand doeth. And when Christ was held back from using His power, it was by the same kind of motive which still holds back every man who is wise as well as kind, when often he longs to help, but may not, and can only pass by. However rich you are, you dare not scatter your wealth broadcast among the needy, to do them incalculable harm. And, in like manner, our Lord was constantly checked in the exercise of His power, because He *could* only help those who were fit to be helped. He was far too kind to cure men's bodies at the expense of their souls. He desired to say "thy sins be forgiven thee" in the same breath in which He said "arise and walk." But often He was hindered by the evil in the men whom He longed to bless, and "He was able to do no mighty work because of their unbelief."

Jesus Christ rejoiced in doing good. Alike in the exercise of His power and in its restraint, He followed the simple prompting of His own overflowing tenderness, His own instinctive wisdom. But though doing good was natural to Him, it was never easy. Be-

yond the opposition and unbelief of men, every miracle seems to have cost Him an effort. Virtue went out of Him as it went into the weak. By mysterious sympathy, He took the sicknesses that He cured, and bare the infirmities that He ended, and suffered for the sins that He forgave. In all our human affliction He was Himself afflicted: it pierced His heart; and though He saved others, He could not save Himself. He never had one thought or wish to save Himself; His delight was to spend Himself for the world. He went about doing good, simply and naturally, because He loved the work in spite of its unspeakable cost. Christ's supreme gladness was self-sacrifice. The Man of Sorrows was happy—happy to live and labour, to suffer and die as He did. “*For the joy set before Him, He endured the cross, despising the shame.*”

“*And behold He hath sat down at the right hand of the throne of God.*” For the heart of God Almighty is opened to us in His Son. The blessedness of heaven is the same blessedness which made Christ eager to endure that He might redeem. In that Divine life and death we see revealed the eternal nature, the eternal beatitude. God shows us what is the root and ground of His own Being. We learn how love must always delight itself in sacrifice; we understand how God Himself is love.

And this, which fills the throne of heaven, is also the highest bliss we can know on earth. Here is the supreme experience, the star-like rapture worth all the world beside; it is born out of pain willingly endured for love's sake. Even in this life it is possible to gather grapes of thorns; and when we taste the wine which Christ's hand has pressed from that strange vintage, we find how no other wine, that maketh glad the heart of man, is worthy to be compared with it. God has prepared many good things for us, here below; but the immortal joy which, for love's sake, can endure the cross and despise the shame, far, far transcends them all. When once we set our lips to the cup of its sacrament, we can only say, “Thou hast kept the best wine until now.”

T. H. DARLOW.

SURVEY OF RECENT BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

A NEW and enlarged edition of the well-known *Annotated Paragraph Bible* has been issued by the Religious Tract Society. It is probably the best annotated Bible in one volume.—Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. issue a volume of their *Pulpit Commentary*. It contains the six books from Nahum to Malachi, which have been entrusted for exegesis to the competent hands of Mr. Deane, and for homiletics to Dr. Whitelaw and others. The volume cannot be neglected by students of the Minor Prophets.—A remarkable and in one respect monumental work is completed by the publication (Williams & Norgate) of the third volume of Dr. S. C. Malan's *Original Notes on the Book of Proverbs mostly from Eastern Writings*. The notes in the whole book number about 16,000, and they are drawn from Egyptian, Sanscrit, Persian, Arabic, Chinese, and many other sources. The book is a monument of learning and industry, and from its abundant stores all future commentators will draw.—To the Expositor's Bible three volumes have recently been added: Archdeacon Farrar's second volume on the *Books of Kings*, a picturesque and thoroughly well-informed narrative; an exposition of the *Epistles of Peter* by Prof. Lumby, who probably knows more about them than any other living scholar; and Principal Moule's *Epistle to the Romans* which will for some time to come oust from common use all other commentaries on the Epistle.—Messrs Clark, of Edinburgh, have issued *The Earliest Life of Christ ever compiled from the Four Gospels, being the Diatessaron of Tatian*, by the Rev. J. Hamlyn Hill, B.D. This useful volume furnishes us with a translation of the Diatessaron, and of the Ephraem Fragments, with introduction and critical and analytical tables of great value. It is a book of which every student of the New Testament or of the Early Church should be in possession.—The Clarendon Press issues another portion of the writings of Tertullian edited by T. Herbert Bindley, B.D., Principal of Codrington College. It is the *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, the *Ad Martyras*, and *Ad Scapulam* which are now published. The notes are excellent and precisely what a student needs. The reading of one such original text gives more insight into early history than much second-hand information.—*The Gospel according to Peter*, a study by the author of *Supernatural Religion* (Longmans, Green & Co.), contains

the text and a translation of this Gospel, together with a critical comparison of it with the canonical Gospels. It displays the scholarship, acuteness and prejudice of the author.—Messrs Macmillan & Co. have published three volumes of sermons, one of which contains some of the charges of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and is entitled *Fishers of Men*. Would that these wise counsels were not only universally read but universally regarded and followed.—The volume by Bishop Westcott on *The Incarnation and Common Life* is in the best sense a book for the times and illustrates the remarkable conversion of a mature scholar into an apt and influential man of affairs.—The Hon. and Rev. Arthur Temple Lyttelton's *University and College Sermons* afford excellent specimens of the treatment of doctrinal subjects in a simple and graceful style.—The same firm also publishes the late Dr. Hort's Hulsean Lectures for 1871, *The Way, the Truth, the Life*, in which there is much original and weighty thinking.—One of the most striking volumes of sermons which have appeared for some time is *The Beauty of the Lord and other Sermons* by Joseph Halsey, of Anerley Congregational Church (James Clarke & Co.).—In the "Life Indeed" Series, edited by the Rev. W. L. Watkinson (Charles H. Kelly), two volumes have appeared, *The Inspirations of the Christian Life*, by Thomas F. Lockyer, B.A., a happy idea happily carried out; and *The Holy Spirit and Christian Privilege*, by Thomas G. Selby, a volume which throws a great deal of light on a very difficult subject and presents a large amount of truth with all Mr. Selby's well-known vigour and attractiveness of style.—The same publishers add to their "Books for Bible Students" an *Introduction to the Study of Hebrew*, by J. T. L. Maggs, B.A. There was room for such a book, and nothing could surpass the beauty with which both Hebrew and English are here printed. The Syntax is scanty, but the Accidence is full and clear. The volume promises to be most helpful to those beginning the study of Hebrew.—In Hodder and Stoughton's "Theological Educator," Prof. Adeney has issued *The Theology of the New Testament*. This is a model book of its kind. It omits no point of importance: it is well-informed, thoughtful, adequate. It must inevitably take its place in theological colleges as a text-book. To the same series Prof. Iverach contributes a notable volume on *Christianity and Evolution*. Seldom is so much hard thinking packed into so small a compass, or so difficult a subject

so competently discussed. It would not be easy to find a more acute philosophical critic than Dr. Iverach; and all interested in the theological and other questions raised by evolution will find fresh light in this volume.—We should like to direct the attention of students to two new and excellent treatises on New Testament Greek. The one is M. L'Abbé Viteau's *Étude sur le Grec du Nouveau Testament: Le Verbe* (Paris, Emile Bouillon). The other is Prof. Burton's *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek* (University Press of Chicago). Both of these are full, careful, and serviceable books, and can be recommended.

The following have also reached us: Archdeacon Perowne's *Our High Priest in Heaven*, second edition (Ellicott Stock); *The Spiritual Grasp of the Epistles*, by Rev. Charles A. Fox, B.A. (S. W. Partridge and Co.); *From the Death of St. Athanasius to the Death of St. Basil (A.D. 373–381)*, by Canon Jenkins, M.A. (David Nutt); *The Christ has Come; The Second Advent, an Event of the Past*, by E. Hampden Cooke, M.A. (Simpkin Marshall and Co.); *One Fold and one Shepherd*, by George Trobridge (James Speirs); *Foreign Missions and Home Calls*, twentieth thousand (Ellicott Stock).—The Religious Tract Society issue the twelfth volume of their *Present Day Tracts*. It contains contributions from Dr. Angus, Dr. Sterling Berry, Dr. S. G. Green, and other well-known writers. *A Year with Christ*, by F. Harper, M.A., Rector of Hinton Waldrist (John F. Shaw and Co.), consists of meditations arranged according to the ecclesiastical year.—Messrs. T. and T. Clark have issued in a tasteful form three lectures by Professors Rainy, Orr, and Dods in reply to Professor Pfeleiderer's Gifford Lectures.—From the Religious Tract Society we have received the first two volumes of a series which promises to be useful, *Present Day Primers*. These volumes are *Early Church History* from the competent hand of Mr. J. Vernon Bartlet, of Mansfield College, and *The Printed English Bible*, by Mr. Richard Lovett, M.A., who has previously shown his acquaintance with at least one chapter in the annals of the English Bible. To their "By-paths of Bible Knowledge" series the same Society has also added a very useful manual on the *Money of the Bible*, written by a numismatic expert, Mr. G. L. Williamson.

MARCUS DODS.

NOTES ON THE REIGN OF JOASH.

THE reign of Joash, as recorded in the two narratives of 2 Kings xi., xii., and 2 Chronicles xxiii., xxiv., is not only of great intrinsic interest, but brings into prominence many of the problems which affect our estimate of the Books of Chronicles. It is therefore, indirectly, important as bearing on the current questions of the higher criticism, and of the place which particular books and passages of Scripture — apart from the divine revelation which the Bible contains — are to hold in our religious system. I think then that it may not be useless to consider the reign of Joash with reference to these inquiries.

1. Every disaster and vexation which troubled the good Jehoshaphat arose from his alliance with Ahab, and his wish to cement that alliance by marrying his son Jehoram to Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel. Jehoram of Judah, during his calamitous reign, was entirely under the influence of his half-Phœnician wife, and she was “the counsellor to do wickedly” of his son Ahaziah. Jehoram-ben-Jehoshaphat only reigned eight years, during which he was first defeated by the Edomites, and then by the Arabians and Philistines, who slew all his sons except the youngest, usually known as Ahaziah, but also called Jehoahaz (2 Chron. xxi. 17), and Azariah (*id.* xxii. 6). Ahaziah succeeded at the age of twenty-two, and was murdered by Jehu’s orders in Megiddo (2 Kings ix. 27) or Samaria (2 Chron. xxii. 9), after reigning a single year. On hearing the news of his death, together with the subsequent massacre of forty-two of his “brethren” by Jehu at Beth-eqed-haroim, Athaliah determined not to give up her high

rank as Gebîrah or queen-mother, but to make herself queen-regnant in spite of the fact that the reign of a queen—much more of a Baal-worshipping and half-alien queen—was a thing unknown either in Israel or in Judah. True daughter of Jezebel in courage and ruthlessness, unsoftened by her very recent widowhood and the murder of her only son, she arose and destroyed all the seed-royal of the house of Judah. Seeing that (1) Ahaziah and forty-two royal personages had just been slaughtered by Jehu; and (2) that every one of the sons of Jehoram, except Ahaziah, his youngest, had been slain by the Philistines and Arabians; and (3) that Ahaziah was only twenty-two when he died, it is difficult to imagine that her grandchildren could have been very numerous; and we must suppose that when the chronicler speaks “of the *sons* of Athaliah, that wicked woman,” he must mean her followers. In any case, the direct line of the House of David, which was heir to so many mighty promises, was at this time more nearly in peril of extinction than at any other period of Judæan history.

2. Its destiny hung on the life of an infant, the son of Ahaziah, by Zibiah of Beersheba. The child’s aunt—Jehosheba or Jehoshabeath, sister of King Ahaziah—succeeded in stealing him from the seraglio with his nurse, and hid him in the store-chamber of the palace, where beds and mats were kept.

The event is very surprising. Ahaziah’s children must have been few; and even when we bear in mind the secrets which were hidden from the outer world in oriental harems, we know that their interior buzzed with minute and incessant gossip. Such a circumstance as the anticipated birth of a child is instantly whispered to all the wives and concubines, and the actual birth of a son is an event of capital importance, which, in so narrow a space, could not possibly be concealed from any member of the little com-

munity. Ahaziah would have had no reason at all to hide from his mother, the great Gebirah, that she had another grandchild; and when we recall the policy of "Thorough" on which she and her mother always acted, we cannot but be astonished that she overlooked the fact that one of the king's sons had been snatched from her murderous designs to become in the future an inevitable Goël. But headlong wickedness is often very blind.

3. The child, says the historian, "was with Jehosheba hid in the House of the Lord six years."

There would be little or no difficulty in hiding him in the Temple when once he had been securely removed into it from the store-room of bedding in the neighbouring palace. For he may have been housed in any of the numerous buildings which formed the suburbs (*parvarim*) of the sacred building (2 Kings xxiii. 11); or even in one of the three storeys of chambers which rose round the edifice, and which, as we learn from other passages (*e.g.* Neh. xiii. 4, 5), were, to our surprise, used as residences. Athaliah had made Baal-worship popular. Mattan, the priest of the neighbouring temple of Baal, was regarded as a personage of more importance than Jehoiada, and the House of the Lord had fallen into contempt and dilapidation. It was no longer frequented by daily throngs of rejoicing worshippers, and its attendants were few in number.

The information given us by the chronicler that Jehosheba was *the wife* of Jehoiada the priest makes the arrangement seem easier. We have no other authority for the statement, but, like so much of the information derived from this source, it is not unattended with difficulties.

There is no difficulty in the intermarriage of members of different tribes; but in all Scripture history, and down to the marriage of Herod with Mariamne, daughter of Boëthus—whom Herod made high-priest to give a little more dignity to the alliance—we do not find a single other

instance of any union between royal and priestly houses. It is true that Jehoiada is the first who is called "the chief" and "the head priest," a distinctive title which is never given even to Aaron or Eli; but his eminence seems to have been the result of the revolution in which he took part, and of the regency with which it was rewarded.

But besides the isolated character of so exalted a marriage there is another difficulty.

Jehosheba could not at this time have been much older than thirty. For her father, Jehoram, had died at the age of forty, and only nine years had elapsed since his death. But her husband, Jehoiada, must have been *at least* ninety years old; for he died at the age of one hundred and thirty, and he died before—apparently some time before—the death of Joash, who reigned forty years. The quite unique marriage of a princess with a priest is rendered still more surprising when we find that the priest must have been at least sixty years older than his bride, in an epoch and in a country where the average length of life in cities very rarely exceeded sixty.

4. For six years Joash was brought up under the shadow of the Temple. When he reached the age of seven, at which age a Jewish child was much older and more precocious than with us, the priest thought that the time was ripe for striking a blow in favour of his royal ward.

There is a marked difference between the two descriptions of the revolution.

(i.) The historian tells us (2 Kings xi. 4) that Jehoiada summoned "*the rulers over the hundreds of the Carians and runners,*" showed them the little king, and ordered them on the Sabbath (which is here first mentioned in the histories) to guard the Palace with one-third, and the Temple with two-thirds of their number, and to kill any one who came within their ranks. They were all in the Temple court, and when Athaliah entered it, they compelled her to leave

it, between two ranks of armed men, till she was outside the precincts, and then they murdered her.

(ii.) Such a narrative would no doubt seem shocking to the priestly bias and Levitic scruples of the Chronicler, who found it lying before him in the Book of Kings, written a full century or more earlier. He would be displeased (1) by the total silence as to any mention of either priest or Levite in so important a revolution, with the single exception of Jehoiada; and still more (2) by the undisputed presence of foreign mercenaries and palace servants in the actual court of the Temple. His account of the matter gives an entirely different complexion to the whole affair.

According to him, Jehoiada takes five captains of hundreds into his counsel, sends them to gather the Levites and the heads of the fathers out of all the cities of Judah, and they made a covenant with the king in the Temple. Then he orders a third part, not of *the Carians and runners*, but of *the priests and Levites*, to keep the Temple gates; a third part to guard the palace; and a third to stand at the gate of the foundation. *None are to enter the house but the priests and the ministering Levites, "for they are holy."* They are to guard the king while the people keep watch without. Not one word is said about the Carians and runners.

It is perfectly easy, with a little ingenuity, so to manipulate these two narratives, by theories of omission and supplement, as to make them seem equally accurate. But when the discrepancies are so obvious, and when they so exactly coincide with the known object and bias of the Chronicler, it is not easy for one who only seeks the truth, and does not wish it to be obscured by *a priori* dogmatics, to feel any honest contentment with the flexible hypotheses of harmonists between the *Sic* and the *Non*.

5. The Temple courts rarely witnessed a scene more striking than the tumultuary coronation of the little king. De-

testing the hard and manlike spirit of the foreign idolatress, the people had submitted to her tyranny because they did not know that there was still left an heir of David's line. Now, for the first time, they had been suddenly informed that there existed in the Temple solitudes a boy of seven, who was their lawful hereditary king. They were gathered together on some crowded festival, and when the child's life was protected by the lines of guards which formed a sort of triangular barrier in the inner court from the Temple porch to the altar, the priest led the little Joash by the hand, placed him on a platform in full sight of the assembled multitude, and formally crowned him king of Judah. It was the following tumult of acclamation, the shouts of "Long live the king," the hoarse bray of the *shopharoth*, the softer sound of the silver trumpets, and the clash of arms, which roused Athaliah to come hastily into the Temple, and to meet her doom.

6. The actual coronation is described in both records in these words: "He brought forth the king's son, and put the crown upon him *and the testimony*, and they made him king, and *anointed him*."

Except Solomon, he seems to have been the only king of Judah, as Jehu was the only king of Israel, who was specially anointed. The unction of a progenitor was supposed to transmit its sanctity to his descendants, and it was deemed unnecessary to anoint a king except in the case of revolution or of disputed succession. The only point which the Chronicler adds is that "Jehoiada *and his sons* anointed him."

The unique feature in the narrative lies in his words "put upon him the crown *and the testimony*." There is no authority in the Hebrew for the words interpolated in the A. V., "and *gave him* the testimony." Whatever, therefore, "the testimony" was, it was "put upon" the king.

What was "the testimony"?

From the use of the word in Exodus xxv. 16, Psalm lxxviii. 5, Isaiah viii. 16, 20, it is usually understood to be a part of the law, namely, that most ancient nucleus of the Mosaic Law—Exodus xx.—xxiii.—which was specially known as "the Book of the Covenant" (Exod. xxiv. 7). Hence the marginal reference to the "putting the testimony upon the king" (2 Chron. xxiii. 11) is to Deuteronomy xvii. 18. In that passage each new king is bidden to write out "a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests, the Levites." What is there meant by "this law," unless it be the nucleus of Deuteronomy itself (cf. Deut. xxxi. 9, 26, 2 Kings xxii. 8), is not specified; and it is tolerably certain that not a single king of Israel or Judah kept this rule, since, beyond all question, the Book of Deuteronomy, whether it existed or not, was not known till the reign of Josiah. But in any case the marginal reference throws no light whatever on the phrase which it is supposed to elucidate. It would have been quite natural that a roll of the most ancient and essential part of Exodus should have been put *into the king's hand*, though we do not know that this was ever done; and if this roll *was kept inside the ark itself* (Exod. xvi. 34, xxv. 16, 21), even the high priest could not have got at it without reversing every possible Levitic rule. In any case the placing of a roll in the child's hands is obviously wholly different from "putting the testimony *upon* him."

Even the Rabbis felt the difficulty. They said that besides the old heavy crown of Ammon which Joab had taken in the city of waters, and with which he had crowned David, there was a miraculous jewel, so heavy that no one could bear its weight except a genuine son of David's line;¹ that this was therefore used as a test in cases of doubtful succes-

¹ 2 Sam. xii. 30. Compare *Avodah Zara*, p. 441. *Targum on Chronicles. Targ. Jon.*, Lagarde, p. xxiv. Klostermann, p. 431.

sion; that it was called "the testimony," and that Jehoiada used it on this occasion to show that he was not palming upon the nation a supposititious child.¹

But since "the testimony" was something which was "put on" the young king with the crown, it seems to me that Klostermann may not be wrong in the conjecture that for "testimony" עֵדוּת we should read "bracelets," צְעָרוֹת a word which in Hebrew closely resembles it. It is true that the royal bracelet is only mentioned in the case of King Saul (2 Sam. i. 10); but there is nothing remarkable in this, since we only read of the crown in 2 Samuel xii. 30, and we know from the Assyrian and Egyptian sculptures that bracelets were an ordinary part of the royal apparel.

7. Passing over the Levitic measures said to have been taken by Jehoiada in 2 Chronicles xxiii. 18, 19, respecting which the historian is silent, we notice a curious omission. The Chronicler copies the statement that "Joash did right *all the days of Jehoiada the priest*," yet he *omits* the statement that "the high places were not taken away, but that the people still sacrificed and burnt incense in the high places."

Now that he had a *motive* in the omission is obvious. It was his unwillingness to tolerate the thought that not only Joash, for whom he has no liking, but that even Jehoiada—who as a priest-regent is his hero, and almost the first of his order who emerges into any eminence in the long history of the kings—did not suppress the high places. If it was a crime, or at any rate a serious drawback to the unblemished reputation of kings that "the high places were not taken away," how much more heinous in this respect must have been the guilt of a chief priest, who for many years had a

¹ Even Prof. F. W. Newman ventured to suggest that Joash was really a son of Jehoiada and Jehoshebeath! The age of Jehoiada alone would suffice to disprove the conjecture.

predominant influence, and during the earlier part of the minority of Joash even wielded the royal power !

This is entirely in accordance with the general method of the Chronicler in speaking of the high places.

In the reign of Josiah the Book of Deuteronomy, or rather a part of it, was discovered in the temple by the priest Hilkiah, and when it became known, the rule on which it insists with so much earnestness, that Jehovah was only to be worshipped at one central shrine, became an ingrained conviction in the minds of the people.

Two considerations make it obvious that for many previous centuries the use of the high places was regarded as natural, as necessary, as innocent, even as laudable. (i.) They had been freely used by the saintliest of the preceding prophets, judges, and patriarchs. (ii.) There were many occasions on which the religious instincts of the people would lead them to special acts of worship in sacred places, when it was impossible for them to make a long and weary journey to Jerusalem. Palestine abounded in places sanctified by venerable associations, such as Dan, Kadesh, Shechem, Shiloh, Gilgal, Bethel, Beersheba, Hebron; and in these places, and many others, little chapelries had been established, often under trees and on heights, some of which may have been, or have become, idolatrous, but many of which were set apart for the worship of Jehovah. Not even the most pious of the earlier kings had felt the least objection to them. "Asa's heart was *perfect* with the Lord all his days"; nevertheless "the high places were not removed (1 Kings xv. 14). Jehoshaphat was a king of supreme and admirable piety; "nevertheless the high places were not removed" (1 Kings xxii. 43). And when Hezekiah *did* remove the high places, so deep was the wound inflicted on the religious convictions of the people that the Rabshakeh was able to appeal to them whether this was not an act of irreligion which had provoked the wrath

of Jehovah. The Chronicler could not bear the notion that kings so perfect should have felt no scruple against high places, and therefore, with the narrative of the Kings before him, he directly contradicts it. He says that Asa "took away the high places" (2 Chron. xvii. 4), and even "took away out of all the cities of Judah the high places" (v. 5); and the fact that he specifies at the same time the removal of *matsseboth* (pillars), *asherim* (images of the nature-goddess, Asherah), and the images of the sun, furnishes no proof of the gloss that the historian was only thinking of *bamoth* for the worship of Jehovah, and the Chronicler of idolatrous *bamoth*. He also says of Jehoshaphat, "that he took away the high places" (2 Chron. xvii. 6). It is therefore in accordance with his bias that he suppresses the fact of the active continuance of *bamoth*, and the sacrifices therein, even when a priest—and a priest whom he describes as particularly scrupulous about the Levitic ceremonies in the Temple—was all-but on the throne. This, nevertheless, was the fact, and it shows how little the previous pious kings can have regarded themselves as culpable for not abolishing the *bamoth*, which, until the reign of Josiah, seem to have been regarded as a help, not as a hindrance, to sincere religion.

8. The king, who was a child of the Temple, was naturally anxious about the Temple, and it was to him, not to the priest-regent, that the pious thought occurred of restoring the much desecrated House of God.

Here are the two accounts of what occurred. (i.) According to the historian, Joash told the priest to receive all the normal contributions which came to the Temple, both statutory and voluntary, and whatever they could collect from their acquaintance, and to repair the breaches of the House of the Lord. No less than twenty-three years passed, and money had been continuously collected—though in ever decreasing sums, owing to the general supineness and lack

of confidence in the priestly administration—and absolutely nothing had been done. Joash must have been something of a *fainéant*, for the annals of the greater part of his reign are a blank. As he had started the fund for the repair of the Temple, he could not have let so many years elapse without seeing the work carried out if he had been a man of any energy. Certainly it was much more the business of the hoary Regent and of the other priests than it was his; but we see from the example of former kings how easily he could have seen that his commands were obeyed. However, in the twenty-third year of his reign he woke up from the somnolence of his sacerdotal subjection to find that nothing had been done. Summoning the hierarchy, he asked them why they were always collecting money, and yet doing nothing? He did not call them to account as defaulters for what they had received in the past, but took the whole matter out of their hands. They were to receive no more money, and have no more responsibility for the repairs. So Jehoiada took a chest, bored a hole in the lid, and placed it *beside the altar*. All the money which was contributed was put into this chest. When it was full, the High Priest and the king's chancellor opened it, counted it, and paid it direct to the architects and workmen.

(ii.) The *nuances* of the other account are singularly managed. It was indeed impossible for the Chronicler so to tell the story that the priests could escape all blame; on the face of it they had been grossly apathetic and remiss. He says that Joash ordered the priests and Levites to collect money out of all Judah, to go on repairing year by year, and to hasten the matter; and he admits that "*the Levites hastened it not.*" He omits the priests. In point of fact, there seems to have been no distinction between the two till more than two centuries later; but the Chronicler always assumes that the distinction existed. Then the king summons Jehoiada and asks him why he has not required *of the*

Levites “the collection of Moses and of the congregation,” since the sons of Athaliah, that wicked woman, had “broken up the House of God” and given its treasures to the temple of Baal. Then *the king* orders a chest to be made, which is placed, not “*beside the altar*,” but *at the entrance gate* of the Temple. The king proclaims a collection; confidence is restored; money flows in; and the work is done. The historian says that from this contribution no vessels of gold or silver were made. The Chronicler says that some was left over, and out of the surplus were made vessels of gold and silver.

The neglect, if not the rapacity, of Jehoiada and the priests is obvious even in the mild story of the Chronicler. It has never been sufficiently noticed how very bad a record the priests—between whom and the Levites there is no apparent difference before the days of Ezekiel—bear throughout the long centuries of Jewish history. They scarcely ever merge into prominence at all, and when they do their line of action is rarely to their credit.

9. At this point the brief annals of the Book of Kings tell us nothing more about Joash until the story of the Syrian inroad, and of the king’s death. But in the Chronicler follows a dark and startling record.

He first narrates the death of his hero Jehoiada, who, he says, died at the age of one hundred and thirty, and, by a unique honour, was buried in the “city of David among the kings, because he had done good in Israel, both towards God and towards his house.”

(i.) We have already pointed out one difficulty about Jehoiada’s age. If he lived till one hundred and thirty, even if we suppose that he did not die till very near the close of the forty years’ reign of Joash, he would have been ninety years old when he headed the revolution against Athaliah. Yet if Joash only survived him by a few years, his asserted apostacy becomes more inconceivable. Cer-

tainly Jehoiada was alive in the twenty-third year of the reign of Joash, and apparently some years after. Supposing that he lived through even thirty years of the reign of Joash, he must then have been one hundred years old when he placed Joash on the throne. There must surely be some mistake in the number one hundred and thirty in 2 Chronicles xxx. 15. Such a length of years at this period of history is entirely unprecedented. It is, for instance, doubtful whether a single king of Judah, after David, attained the age of seventy years. Most of them died much earlier, and not a few did not attain the age of fifty.

(ii.) Again, the eulogy bestowed on Jehoiada is surprising. One would have thought that the hated king had done much more for the House of God than the highly lauded priest. It was the king, not the priest, who had suggested the restoring of the Temple from the ruinous condition into which it had fallen. It was the king, not the priest, who, after twenty-three years had elapsed, rescued the work from the slothful hands of its official guardians, and saw it carried to a successful issue. On the face of both records Jehoiada had been disastrously indifferent to a duty so sacred and so essential. We know nothing more of him from the historian, but a very unfavourable light is thrown on his memory if, as seems probable, he is the Jehoiada referred to in Jeremiah xxix. 26. There Shemaiah the Nehelamite appeals by letter to all the priests to show themselves worthy of their position by carrying out the decree of "Jehoiada the priest," to the effect that "every man that is mad and maketh himself a prophet should be put in the stocks and the collar." There is always an almost unbroken antagonism between priests and prophets. To Shemaiah and the priests, Jeremiah was a mere excited false prophet; and to the priests of Jerusalem, six centuries later, John the Baptist had a devil, and the Lord of Glory was Beelzebub. The autocratic decree of Jehoiada was little to his credit.

It was a fatal weapon of religious persecution to quench the Spirit in God's prophets. If the Jehoiada who laid down this rule was the priest-regent, he must rank as the first of the Inquisitors.

10. Next we are told by the Chronicler that no sooner was Jehoiada dead than "the princes of Judah came and made obeisance to Joash," and at a breath he abandoned every tradition of his life, lost all care for the Temple of Jehovah, in which he had been nurtured, and which had furnished the main interest of his uneventful reign, and at once began to serve the *asherim* and idols. God sent prophets, who rebuked Judah and Jerusalem in vain. Then the Spirit of God came upon Zechariah, the son and successor of Jehoiada, who "stood above the people" and denounced, that as they had forsaken God, God had also forsaken them, so that they could not prosper. Then, *at the commandment of the king*, the people stoned Zechariah to death in the Temple court, nay, according to 2 Chronicles xxiv. 25, Joash not only murdered Zechariah, but other "sons" of Jehoiada. It is a tale of black ingratitude; but if it be true, how are we to account for the complete silence of the earlier and better historian? Is it not just possible that Joash may be less guilty than the narrative would imply? May not the circumstances narrated have arisen from some internecine struggle between a royal party and a priestly party, and from some effort to throw off the yoke of priestly dominance, to which the king had for so many years been entirely subjected?

Talmudic legends represent Zechariah as a man of so insatiably revengeful a character that even two centuries later, when Nebuchadrezzar took Jerusalem, his blood, crying fiercely from the ground, could not be appeased by a perfect *χιλιομβή* of victims—940,000, according to the monstrous exaggeration of the Talmud (*Gittin*, p. 57, and *Sanhedrin*, p. 962)—young and old and of every rank,

slaughtered by the Babylonians over the place of his martyrdom. The only basis for the legend is the priest's dying exclamation, "The Lord look upon it, and require it."

11. Only two events remain.

(i.) Hazael of Damascus, says the historian, made a raid against Gath, took it, and "set his face to go up to Jerusalem." Joash at once collected all the treasures of the often-despoiled temple, and of the often-despoiled palace, and sent them to Hazael, who thereupon went away from Jerusalem.

(ii.) In the Levitic Chronicler everything is told in a way which enhances the disgrace and misery of the king who had caused such deep offence to priests. He says that "at the end of the year the host of Syria came to Jerusalem and destroyed all the princes of the people" (who had tempted Joash to apostasy), "and sent all *their* spoil" (not a word of the Temple spoil) to Hazael. For Hazael had only sent "a small company," and Jehovah "delivered a very great host into their hand."

12. Then comes the end.

(i.) The historian only says that Jozachar, the son of Shimeah, and Jehozabad, the son of Shomer, conspired against Joash and slew him in Beth-Millo which goeth down to Silla.

(ii.) The Chronicler says that the Syrians "left Joash in great pain" or "diseases,"—perhaps the allusion is to wounds received in the disgraceful rout,—and that "his own servants conspired against him *for the blood of the sons of Jehoiada the priest*, and slew him on his bed, and he died"; and that "great burdens," *i.e.*, woeful and numerous oracles had been uttered against him.

Apparently, then, Joash perished in a conspiracy which originated in the revenge of the priestly party (Jos., *Antt.*, ix. 8, § 4). But there is something significant about the

names of the two murderers in the Book of Kings—“Jozachar, the son of Shimeah, and Jehozabad the son of Shomer.” They mean “the Lord hath endowed,” “the son of remembrance,” and “the Lord hath bestowed,” the “son of hearing.” This may, of course, be accidental, but it certainly recalls in a curious manner the last words attributed to Zechariah, “the Lord *look upon it and require it.*” Is it permissible to conjecture that in this, as in other instances, tradition has been influenced by names? In the Chronicler there has been some confusion: he tells us that ben-Shimeah and ben-Shimrith are not (as is almost invariably the case) *patronymics* but *metronymics*, and that Shimeah was an Ammonitess, and Shimrith a Moabitess; but he calls the two murderers *Zabad* and Jehozabad.

13. Even as to the *burial* of Joash there is a difference in the two accounts. The historian says (2 Kings xii. 21) that they “buried Joash *with his fathers* in the city of David”; the Chronicler says, “They buried him in the city of David, but they *buried him not in the sepulchres of the kings.*”

No honest and truth-loving reader can study side by side the Books of Kings and Chronicles without seeing that the differences between them are very marked. In some records there are discrepancies which are not indeed beyond the possibility of removal, by a ramification of ingenious hypotheses, but as to which the hypotheses must be largely conjectural. The conception which we should derive of various kings and of many incidents in their reigns from the *combined* narratives is very far from identical with that which we should have gained from either narrative singly. We observe further that throughout the pages of the Chronicler the *numbers* are marked by that disease of exaggeration which affects all the later literature of the Jews; that the compiler allows himself (as was common in ancient records) a considerable amount of license in reporting speeches; and that, from beginning to end,

the record shows a priestly and Levitic bias. Now the Chronicles are an accepted part of canonical Scripture, and have been rightly received as such. They contain much most valuable information; they abound in passages full of religious edification; they supplement our knowledge in important particulars. On the other hand, when there is any direct collision between the records, we must remember that the Chronicles are the latest book of Scripture, bearing marks of the hand of the editor down even to the days of Alexander the Great; that they did not assume their present form till a full century later than the Kings; that as the rest of Scripture, revealed in human language to men for men, is not exempt from human conditions, so this book reflects the characteristics of the epoch in which it arose. Now that epoch was marked by the prevalence of the Levitic scrupulosity, which blossomed into perfect Pharisaism; and it made large use of those forms of edifying parable which were known as *Haggadoth*. How far some of the narratives of the Books of Chronicles may—with no more intention to mislead than the books of Job, of Jonah, or of Esther, for instance—have admitted the *haggadistic* element for the innocent and laudable purpose of moral instruction, is a question which cannot perhaps be decided at present. For these accounts of Joash, the Chronicler expressly refers us to “the *Midrash* of the Book of the Kings.” Now the *Midrash* did not pretend to be mere plain history. It was history touched with moral amplification.¹ It was in later times described as consisting of PRDS (Paradise), *i.e.* *Peshat* (literal sense);

¹ For further explanation, see the author's Bampton Lectures (*History of Interpretation*), pp. 95–97. Ginsburg, s.v. *Midrashim*, in Kitto's Cyclopædia, etc. The Jewish *Midrash* is avowedly a sort of “Moralising Romance,” and the Chronicler refers for his authorities to the “*Midrash* of Iddo” (R.V. “Commentary,” A.V. “Story,” 2 Chron. xiii. 22), and to “the *Midrash* of the Book of Kings” (*id.*, xxiv. 27). See W. Robertson Smith's *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 148.

Remes (hint or amplification); *Deruch*, or *homiletic application*; *Sōd* (mystery, or *Kabbalah*). This, at any rate, is obvious, that we must not too harshly condemn and exalt the kings of Judah on grounds respecting which the earlier and more accurate authority is silent, and of which we find traces in the Books of Chronicles alone.

F. W. FARRAR.

NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING ON THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST.

II. THE TEACHING OF ST. PAUL.

IN this paper I shall endeavour to reproduce St. Paul's conception of the Second Coming of Christ; and to determine the place and comparative importance of this topic in his conception of the Gospel as a whole. In so doing, I shall take his Epistles in chronological order. And with these I shall compare a single reference to the same subject in an address recorded in the Book of Acts.

In 1 Thessalonians i. 10, St. Paul describes his readers' conversion as a turning "from the idols to serve a living and true God and to wait for His Son from heaven." This implies that during the few weeks in which he had founded the church at Thessalonica he had taught his young converts that Christ, "raised from the dead," would return from heaven to earth; and implies also that an expectation of His return was a conspicuous element of the new life and hope which they had received.

In chapter ii. 19 we read, "what is our hope or joy or crown of our exultation? Are not even ye before our Lord Jesus at His coming?" Similarly in chapter iii. 13: "establish your hearts unblameable in holiness before our God and Father at the coming of our Lord Jesus with all His saints." In chapter iv. 13-18, St. Paul seeks to remove

sorrow caused by the death of some members of the church by pointing to the return of Christ and to the consequent resurrection of the dead. In contrast to those for whom his readers mourn, the Apostle speaks of himself and them as "being left behind for the coming of the Lord." In each of these three passages, and in others similar, the English rendering *coming* represents the conspicuous Greek word *παρουσία*, which now demands attention.

Like the verb *πάρεστι*, the substantive *παρουσία* denotes the presence of someone standing by. So Philippians ii. 12, where it is contrasted with *ἀπουσία*, "not as in my *presence* only, but now much more in my absence": and 2 Corinthians x. 10, "the *presence* of the body (*i.e.* St. Paul's bodily presence) is weak." More frequently it denotes the presence of a fresh arrival. So 1 Corinthians xvi. 17, "I rejoice at the *coming* (*ἐπὶ τῇ παρουσίᾳ*) of Stephanas"; 2 Corinthians vii. 6, 7, "the *coming* of Titus," twice; Philippians i. 26, "my *coming* again to you." The same word is used to describe the coming of Christ for which the Christians at Thessalonica were waiting, in 1 Thess. ii. 19, iii. 13, iv. 15 quoted above; in chapter v. 23, 2 Thess. ii. 1, 8, 1 Corinthians xv. 23, as also in James v. 7, 8, 2 Peter i. 16, iii. 4, 12, 1 John ii. 28, Matthew xxiv. 3, 27, 37, 39. This use of the same word with the same reference by different writers of the New Testament proves it to be a technical term of the early followers of Christ denoting their master's expected return. And its suitability is at once apparent. Touching His bodily form, Christ is now *absent* in heaven: on that day He will be visibly *present* on earth. And His presence will bring in at once the great consummation for which His followers are waiting.

The *coming* of Christ and its immediate consequences are described with graphic detail in 1 Thessalonians iv. 16, 17: "the Lord Himself, with shout, with voice of archangel, with trumpet of God, (notice the climax,) will come down

from heaven ; and the dead in Christ will rise first." Then will the living, who, as St. Paul writes, are "being left behind" by the hand of death while others are taken away, be snatched up, along with those just raised from the dead, into a supermundane region, surrounded by clouds, to meet their Lord. And, "in this way" entering into His presence they will be with Him for ever.

The word *first* emphasises the priority of their resurrection to the meeting of the living ones with Christ. It thus supports the assertion in verse 15: "We, the living ones, . . . shall in no wise precede those that have fallen asleep." It finds a counterpart in verse 17: "the dead in Christ will rise *first*; then the living ones . . . shall be caught up." This simple and complete explanation of these words, forbids us to infer from them a later resurrection of the dead without Christ. Of these last nothing whatever is here said. Writing as a servant of Christ, the Apostle thinks only of His fellow-servants, dead and living. Evidently the words "we the living" refer only to believers. For they only "will be for ever with the Lord." All others lie outside the writer's thought. We have simply the shout, the descent, the resurrection, and the snatching up of the living servants of Christ to meet Him in the air.

In 1 Thess. v. 2 we read that the "day of the Lord so cometh as a thief at night." The words *ἡμέρα Κυρίου* are already familiar to us as the LXX. rendering of "the day of Jehovah" in the passages from the prophets quoted in my last paper. It is impossible to doubt that here the day of the Lord is the time of the return of Christ already mentioned in each of the first four chapters of this epistle. And, if so, verse 3 asserts that the coming of Christ, which to His servants dead and living will be a reunion with their Lord, will be to others "sudden destruction." This is in close agreement with the passages from the Old Testament quoted in my last paper in which the day of Jehovah is

described as a time of punishment to the wicked and of blessing to the righteous. It implies that at Christ's coming there will be sin and sinners upon earth.

Then follows a beautiful metaphor based on the word *day*. To the wicked, the return of Christ will come suddenly and unexpectedly, "as a thief at night," under cover of darkness. But St. Paul's readers "are not in darkness." Consequently, "the day" will not "lay hold" of them "as does a thief." They are "sons of light and sons of day." The Apostle bids them act as such, as men do who walk in light, whom no thief can surprise. The same metaphor meets us again, in a later group of St. Paul's letters, in Romans xiii. 11-13: "The hour has come that we at once awake from sleep . . . The night is far spent, the day has drawn near. Let us then put off the work of darkness and put on the weapons of the light. As in the day, let us walk decently." In contrast to the Day of the Lord, the present life seemed to this great teacher to be but the passing hours of a *night*. And already to the eye of faith the dawning light proclaims that the day is near.

The word *παρρησία* meets us for the fourth time in this short epistle in chapter v. 23, where St. Paul prays that his readers may be "preserved blamelessly in the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." He desires that in the day of judgment they may be found blameless.

In a second letter to the same Church at Thessalonica, the Apostle writes to correct, apparently, a misunderstanding of his earlier letter. He speaks in chapter i. 6 of a just recompense, viz. affliction for those who afflict, and for those who are afflicted rest; and speaks of this as taking place "at the revelation of Jesus Christ from heaven with angels of His power." We have here another phrase describing evidently the coming of Christ for which the Thessalonian Christians were waiting, "the revelation (or unveiling) of the Lord Jesus." He is now hidden from our

view; but in that day the veil will be rent, and the hidden One will appear. In other words, the coming of Christ will be not only audible but visible. Since the veiled One is in heaven, and on that day will appear on earth, the unveiling is said to be "from heaven"; as in 1 Thessalonians iv. 16, we read that He "will come down from heaven." He will be accompanied by inhabitants of heaven, ministers of His power; and by *fire*, the most searching of natural forces.

The punishment and persons punished, already described in verse 6, and the punishment said in verse 7 to be inflicted at the revelation of the Lord Jesus, are in verses 8, 9 further specified. He will inflict vengeance on "those who know not God, and who obey not the Gospel." Their penalty will be "eternal destruction," removing them "from the face" of Christ and from the splendour which belongs to the power which on that day He will put forth.

The time of this punishment is further described as "when He shall come to be glorified in (or among) His saints, and to be wondered at in all those that believed." The words "when He shall come," used evidently as an equivalent to "at the revelation of the Lord Jesus" in verse 7, still further identify this last phrase as a description of the event for which the readers of this epistle were waiting. The words "in that day" recall the same words in Isaiah ii. 11 and eleven times in Zechariah xii.-xiv., as quoted in my last paper. It is another link between the Day of the Lord in the New Testament and the Day of Jehovah in the Old.

In chapter ii. 1, St. Paul speaks again "about the coming (*τῆς παρουσίας*) of our Lord Jesus Christ and our gathering together before Him." He warns his readers against supposing that "the day of the Lord has come," *i.e.* is now beginning; thus linking together, as technical terms for the same event, the *παρουσία* and "the Day of the Lord." He

adds that Christ will not come (chapter i. 10) until "the Apostacy come first"; that there will be no "revelation of the Lord Jesus" (chapter i. 7) until "the man of sin be revealed." This "son of destruction" is then further described. Something now holds him back, in order that he "may be revealed in his (appropriate) season." The revelation of this "lawless one" is in verse 9 described as a *παρουσία* and as accompanied by a manifold and mighty activity of Satan which will deceive and destroy those who refuse to believe the truth. This use of the same words *παρουσία* and *revelation* (or *revealed*) to describe the advent of the "son of destruction" and that of Christ places these two antagonistic forces in conspicuous and awful contrast.

This teaching implies that the coming of Christ will be preceded by the appearance of a new and terrible form of evil. In marked contrast to this future *revelation* we are told in verse 7 that "the *mystery* of lawlessness is already working," although under restraint. When this restraint is removed, it will be *revealed*, *i.e.* will work, no longer secretly, but openly. This revelation marks a conspicuous development of evil on earth. What this new form of evil will be, we know not except as it is dimly shadowed forth in this chapter. But, that its manifestation is to be a new era in the working of the kingdom of darkness, implies that it will be altogether different from all the kinds of evil now seen at work around us. We must be content with the general description here given, *viz.* that it will be an activity of Satan, that it will claim divine honours, and will delude those who reject the light of the Gospel.

The course of events is further described in verses 7, 8. We have a restraining influence, "until it be taken out of the way: and then will the Lawless One be revealed, whom the Lord Jesus will slay with the breath of His mouth and will bring to nothing by the appearance of His coming": τῆ ἐπιφάνειά τῆς παρουσίας. This implies that the

coming of Christ will be visible, that up to the moment of His appearance a new and terrible form of evil will be in power, and that this hostile power will fade into nothing at the voice and appearance of Christ.

Such is the clear and harmonious teaching of the Epistles to the Thessalonians. St. Paul was looking for a definite time when Christ will audibly and visibly return from heaven to earth, to raise His dead servants, to welcome all His servants dead and living into endless and blessed intercourse with Himself, and to destroy all who refuse to obey the Gospel. He taught also that this revelation of Christ, who is now hidden from our view, will be preceded by an outward manifestation, in some new and awful form, of that evil which is already secretly operating among men, and that this new manifestation of it will continue in power until it be dethroned by the appearance of Christ.

The frequent occurrence in these early epistles of the terms *παρουσία*, *day of the Lord*, *revelation*, *appearance*, which we shall find used frequently not only in the other epistles of St. Paul but also in other parts of the New Testament, proves that they were already technical terms used to describe the expected return of Christ.

Similar teaching is found in St. Paul's other letters; but not with equal prominence. The Corinthian Christians, as we read in 1 Corinthians i. 7, 8, were "waiting for the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ"; and the Apostle hoped that "in the day of our Lord Jesus" they will be without reproach. So familiar to his thought was that time that he speaks of it in chapter iii. 13 as "the day," and declares, in close agreement with 2 Thessalonians i. 8, that "it will be revealed in fire," and that the fire will test every man's work and determine his reward. In chapters iv. 5, xi. 26, we have casual references to the coming of Christ.

In 1 Corinthians xv. 20-23 St. Paul asserts, as already in 1 Thessalonians iv. 14, 16, that just as Christ rose from the

dead so will His servants rise : “ as firstfruit, Christ, then they who are Christ’s at His coming (*ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ*), then the end.” Here, as in 1 Thessalonians iv. 16, St. Paul speaks only of the resurrection of the servants of Christ. All others are throughout the chapter left entirely out of sight. So especially in verse 43, “ it is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory ; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power,” words true only of the saved. This being so, we have no right to infer from the passage before us that at the coming of Christ only His people will rise.

The resurrection of the righteous is more fully described in verses 50–57. We have here not only a definite day but a definite moment, and we have again the sound of a trumpet, a sound never to be repeated ; “ in a moment, in a twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet.” And, as before, the trumpet will be at once followed by resurrection of the dead. As before, the raising of the dead will affect the living. We are now told that these last will be changed. This change is made needful by the constitution of their bodies, which unfits them for the kingdom of God : “ flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.” But the corruptible and mortal will clothe itself with incorruption and deathlessness. This will be the last victory over the last enemy.

The resurrection of believers mentioned in this chapter is evidently bodily : “ it is sown a soul-governed body, it is raised a spiritual body.” So Romans viii. 11, “ will make alive your mortal body ” : and Philippians iii. 21, “ will transfigure the body of our humiliation.” Consequently, the resurrection of Christ must also be bodily. For a merely spiritual manifestation of Christ after His death could not remove objections to a bodily resurrection of believers. And if the resurrection of Christ and of His people be bodily, Christ’s return to earth must also be bodily. In other words, St. Paul expected that the body of

Christ raised (Romans viii. 34) from the grave to heaven will in that day return from heaven to earth.

This expectation does not imply that the resurrection body of believers will contain the same particles of matter as that laid in the grave. Indeed these particles do not continue the same during life. But it seems to me to imply that our spirits will again clothe themselves in bodily forms ; in forms related probably, in some way to us inconceivable but real, to the bodies laid in the grave.

In 1 Corinthians xv. 51, as in 1 Thessalonians iv. 15, St. Paul puts himself among those who will survive the coming of Christ : " we, the living, who are being left for the coming of Christ," and " we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed." This implies fairly that the Apostle did not know that long ages would elapse between his own day and the day of Christ. But we have no right to infer that he had a definite and confident expectation that he would himself survive to that day. For, in rhetorical figure he often identifies himself with that which he describes : *e.g.* Romans iii. 7, " If the truth of God by my lie abounded for His glory, why am I also still judged as a sinner ? " Probably in this matter hope and fear alternated with his circumstances and his frame of mind. In 2 Corinthians v. 6-8, he certainly ponders the possibility of his own death ; influenced perhaps by the deadly peril referred to in chapter i. 9. Still, finding himself preserved from day to day, and not knowing how soon Christ will appear, he might easily look upon, and write about, Himself as " being left for the coming of Christ," in contrast to those who had fallen asleep.

This hope, thus faintly expressed, was not destroyed by St. Paul's knowledge that the appearance of " the lawless one " must precede the coming of Christ. For, the wonderfully rapid progress of the Kingdom of God during the last twenty-five or thirty years permitted a hope that the

remaining years of his life might suffice for the appearance and short reign of the man of sin and for his destruction by the appearance of Christ. In any case, St. Paul's hope of himself surviving the coming of Christ, which finds indefinite expression only in these two passages, is no essential part of his plain and abundant and conspicuous teaching that Christ will return to raise the dead and judge all men.

It is worthy of note that the clearest expression of this hope is in the earliest of St. Paul's letters; and that the only other expression of it is in the earliest letter, probably, of the second group. In another letter of the same group, he weighs the possibility of his death; and does this more seriously in a letter of the third group, that to the Philippians. In the last of his letters, the second to Timothy, he contemplates the near approach of death.

Resurrection of the dead is mentioned in 2 Corinthians iv. 14: "He that raised the Lord Jesus will raise us with Jesus." In chapter v. 10, the Apostle asserts that himself and his readers "must be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ, in order that each one may receive the things done through the instrumentality of the body . . . whether good or bad." This suggests irresistibly a simultaneous judgment of good and bad men. In Romans xiv. 10, we have similar teaching.

The Epistle to the Galatians contains no clear reference to the second coming of Christ. But we have in chapter vi. 7, 8, a solemn assertion of exact retribution.

In Romans ii. 5, we read of a "day of anger and of revelation of the righteous judgment of God, who will give back to each one according to his works"; and in verse 16 of a "day when God will judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ." In chapter viii. 19-23 St. Paul declares that the whole "creation is waiting for the revelation of the sons of God;" and that himself and his readers are "waiting for

the redemption of the body." This passage implies that salvation will not be complete until the bodies of the adopted sons of God are rescued from the grave. In chapter xi. 25, 26 he speaks of hardening as having come to Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles come in ; and says that then Israel will be saved. This implies real progress of the kingdom of God under the present order of things. Beyond this progress, we must place the great apostacy mentioned in an earlier epistle. Romans xiii. 11-13, xiv. 10 have been already referred to.

In Philippians i. 6, in the third group of St. Paul's letters, we read of the " day of Jesus Christ " as the time of the completion of the good work already begun in the Christians at Philippi. In chapter iii. 11, he speaks of " the resurrection from the dead " (*ἐκ νεκρῶν*) as the ultimate goal of his desire and effort. The phrase here used is found elsewhere only in Luke xx. 35, for the resurrection of believers, and in Acts iv. 2, 1 Peter i. 3, for that of Christ. It suggests a removal of the risen ones from among the dead ; and is therefore inapplicable to, and is never used for, the lost. For they " shall not see life " (John iii. 36), and will be still dead and among the dead even when risen. But this by no means implies or suggests an earlier resurrection of the saved. For two very different resurrections may take place at the same time, as we read in John v. 29.

In Philippians iii. 20, 21 we read, in close harmony with the passages quoted above, " our commonwealth is in heaven whence we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will transfigure the body of our humiliation conformed to the body of His glory, according to the working whereby He is able even to subject all things to Himself." This transfiguration must include the raising of the dead and the complete change of those who survive the coming of Christ. Each of these will demand a putting forth of the infinite power of Christ. These verses prove that the

alternative of death and life which in chapter i. 20-24 St. Paul ponders so seriously did not prevent him from joining in the joyful hope shared by all the servants of Christ in his day.

In Ephesians iv. 30, the readers are reminded that in the Holy Spirit they "were sealed for the day of redemption." This "redemption" can be no other than that of the body which will rise from the bondage of death on the day of Christ's return. The appearance of Christ is mentioned in Colossians iii. 4, "When Christ who is our life shall be manifested, then shall ye also with Him be manifested in glory." These casual references, amid topics quite different, reveal, deeply rooted in the thought of St. Paul, an expectation of the return of Christ to complete the salvation already begun.

In the last group of his epistles, in 1 Timothy vi. 14, we read "without reproach till the appearance (*τῆς ἐπιφανείας*, as in 2 Thess. ii. 8) of our Lord Jesus Christ." So Titus ii. 13, "waiting for the blessed hope and *appearance* of the glory of the great God and of our Saviour Christ Jesus." In 2 Timothy i. 10 the same word is used of the first coming of Christ, thus putting it in conspicuous relation to His second coming. In verse 18 St. Paul prays that Onesiphorus "may find mercy from the Lord *in that day*." So verse 12, "able to guard *to that day*." These last words, already found in 2 Thessalonians i. 10, occur again in 2 Timothy iv. 8, "the crown which the Lord will give me *in that day*, the righteous Judge, and not to me only but to all them that love His *appearance*." This last word (*ἐπιφανεία*) is that already found in 2 Thessalonians ii. 8, 1 Timothy vi. 14, Titus ii. 13, 2 Timothy i. 10, iv. 8. It occurs also in 2 Timothy iv. 1: "I charge thee in the sight of God and of Christ Jesus, who will judge the living and the dead, and by His appearance and His kingdom."

In St. Paul's address at Athens recorded in Acts xvii.

22-31 we read, in verse 31, "He hath set a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness, in a Man whom He hath marked out." Otherwise, the Second Coming of Christ is not expressly mentioned in his recorded speeches.

From the foregoing it will appear that St. Paul's teaching about the Second Coming of Christ is, both in thought and phraseology, the same in all his epistles. Indeed the chronological order of his letters does not reveal in this subject, as it does in some others, development of thought. Evidently his thought on this topic was fully matured when he wrote his earliest epistles.

It is also worthy of note that in these letters, written to recent converts, the subject before us occupies a much larger place than it does in those written later to older churches. This suggests that St. Paul looked upon the Second Coming of Christ as belonging to the rudiments of the Christian faith. And this we can well understand. In the synagogue at Thessalonica he preached, as we read in Acts xvii. 3, that Jesus is the Anointed Deliverer and that He had risen from the dead. He certainly added (cp. Acts xiii. 38) that through Him is proclaimed forgiveness of sins for all who believe His words. It was natural for him to add, as we infer from 1 Thessalonians v. 1, that He who was raised from the dead will return to reward or punish those who accept or reject His offered salvation. But when converts were gathered together into churches, they would need other teaching about the practical bearing of the Gospel upon the details of personal and social life. This further and more varied teaching would occupy attention, and thus leave less room in the later epistles, as there was less need, for teaching about a topic already sufficiently understood. And, as we have seen, occasional references are not wanting, even in these later letters. The large space occupied by this subject in 1 Thessalonians was also caused apparently by the unexpected death of some church-members

and the sorrow caused thereby: the second letter was written (ch. ii. 1) in part to correct a misunderstanding caused by the first.

The Second Coming of Christ can scarcely be reckoned among the great fundamental doctrines of the Gospel as St. Paul understood it. In the systematic exposition of that Gospel given in the Epistle to the Romans, it has no prominent place; and it receives only casual mention in the profound Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians. But, while occupying only a subordinate place, it is, as the above quotations prove, an essential part (cp. Romans ii. 16) of the Gospel of Paul.

Much less important is the Apostle's faint hope of himself surviving the return of Christ. For this hope finds casual and indefinite expression only in two places in his epistles.

We may now sum up the expectation of the greatest of the Apostles of Christ touching the future. St. Paul looked forward to continued progress of the Gospel, to the gathering in of the fulness of the Gentiles and then of Israel. But beyond this progress he foresaw an awful manifestation, in a new and conspicuous form, of the evil already working in the wicked. This new revelation of evil, in the moment of its power, Christ will dethrone and destroy by His sudden and audible and visible appearance from heaven. At His coming, His dead servants will wake up from their long sleep; and with the changed forms of these still living will enter into the eternal and glorious kingdom of Christ and of God.

With this teaching, I shall in my next paper compare the teaching of Christ as recorded in the Synoptist Gospels.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

ST. PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY.

XIX. THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.

THE title of this article is somewhat vague, but what I have in view is to consider such questions as these: How does the apostle conceive the Christian life in reference to its beginning, how far does he recognise the idea of growth as applicable to that life, what features of that life occupied the place of prominence in his mind?

1. The leading Pauline Epistles contain various forms of representation bearing on the first of these questions. One of the most important and striking occurs in the earliest of the four. I refer to the statement in *Galatians* vi. 15: "Neither circumcision is anything, nor uncircumcision, but a *new creation*" (καινή κτίσις). A certain controversial colouring is discernible here. The supreme importance of the new spiritual creation is asserted against those who set value on rites. As against these St. Paul says in effect: the one thing needful is the new creation; without a share in it the rite of circumcision will do you no good; and if you possess it, the want of circumcision will do you no harm. It is easy to see that the antithesis gives much sharpness and point to the thought expressed by the phrase *καινή κτίσις*. The apostle conceived of Christianity as a new world ushered into being by the divine fiat, and taking the place of an old world worn out and doomed to dissolution. To his opponents he says in effect: God has created a new world in Christ, which is entitled to assert to the full its right of existence. Speak to me no more of circumcision and uncircumcision, Jew and Gentile: these distinctions belong to the old world, which by the very advent of the new has received notice to pass away. Thus viewed, the new creation refers not so much, at least directly, to the religious life of the individual Christian, as

to the whole comprehensive social phenomenon denoted by the term Christianity. But there is little room for doubt that the individual reference was also present to the apostle's mind. For the very antithesis between the new creation and ritual implies that the former is ethical. The new creation is a moral creation, and it is such for the Church collectively, because it is such for each member of the Church. It consists of a community of men who have become partakers of a new life through faith in Christ, and it is because it is so constituted that the *καινὴ κτίσις* is the marvellous thing it is represented to be. Accordingly we find that immediately after mentioning this new creation St. Paul goes on to speak of individual members of the Christian commonwealth in these terms: "As many as walk by this rule, peace be upon them and mercy, even upon the Israel of God." The members of the mystic Israel are thus represented as persons who walk by the rule, or have for their watchword: circumcision nothing, uncircumcision nothing, the new creation everything; and the adoption of this motto is possible only for those who are conscious of a new spiritual life within them.

It is not surprising therefore to find the apostle in a later epistle expressly stating what in the earlier he rather hints than says, viz. that every man who believes in Christ is a new creation. The important text containing the statement is *2 Corinthians* v. 17: "Wherefore if any one in Christ, a new creation, the old things passed away, behold new things have come into being." The sentence is characterised by laconic energy and reveals intense conviction. It is an echo of the prophetic oracle: "Remember ye not the former things, neither consider the things of old. Behold I do new things,"¹ and is directed against the Judaists who were enamoured of the old. For the apostle Christianity is the new thing spoken of by the prophet, and

¹ *Isa.* xliii. 18, 19.

he claims for it, as only what is due to its importance, that in its interest all old things, not excepting even Christ after the flesh, shall be forgotten, as they are by him for his part. But there is much more in his mind than this controversial meaning. When he speaks of a *καινή κτίσις* he has in view a marvellous moral phenomenon that has made its appearance in every man who has truly believed in Christ. A great transformation has taken place. The believer has become in thought, feeling, aim, a new man; old characteristics have disappeared, and new ones have taken their place. If we inquire what the old things vanishing, and the new things replacing the old are, the context helps us to an answer. We find a very significant hint in the words of verse 15: "He died for all that the living might *no longer* live to themselves, but to Him who for them died and rose again." The *μηκέτι* implies that those who believe did formerly live for themselves, and the change that has come over them consists in their resolving to do so no longer. The new creation then, for one thing, signifies selfishness giving place to self-sacrifice for Christ's sake.

Passing from the Epistle to the Corinthians to the Epistle to the Romans, we find the idea of a new creation recurring under slightly altered forms of expression. In the sixth chapter the apostle speaks of *an old man* (*παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος*) implying of course a new, and he represents Christians as called to walk in *newness of life*.¹ The same chapter gives us additional information as to what the newness consists in. In the sequel Christians are exhorted thus: "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body that ye should obey its desires."² The new man, that is, is one who is free, or at least strives to assert his freedom, from the dominion of fleshly desire, and who seeks to make all his members instruments of righteousness. At the commencement of chapter xii., where begins the hortatory

¹ Rom. vi, 4-6.

² Rom. vi, 12.

part of the Epistle, the same truth is suggested by the exhortation to Christians to present their bodies a living sacrifice characterised as a rational service (*λογικὴ λατρεία*, in tacit contrast to the ritual service of the Levitical system under which brute beasts were offered in sacrifice). The exhortation is virtually a summons to mortify the lusts of the flesh, so that the life in the body may be pure and holy. And he is a new man who so puts to death unholy desire and lives a temperate life. The same exhortation recurs in *Romans* xiii., accompanied with some details as to the things to be shunned.¹ Here the doctrine of the new life is stated in altered terms, being represented as a *putting on of Christ Jesus*, Christ being conceived as a new garment to be worn by the Christian in place of an old one. The figure suits a connection of thought in which believers are exhorted to a change of bodily habits; for habits are a garment of the soul. It also supplies us with a link of thought wherewith to connect the two characteristics of the new creation which have come under our notice—self-sacrifice and self-control in reference to personal habits (*ἐγκράτεια*).² That link is Christ. Christ by His redeeming love supplies the motive to self-sacrifice; by the same love and by the purity of His life He furnishes the motive to temperance. It is true that in exhorting to put on Christ the apostle makes no express allusion either to Christ's love or to His holiness. But the exhortation plainly implies that Christ is the model. To put on Christ is to have Christ's habits, to be Christ-like. It further implies that Christ is a power within which generates a new moral habit; and if it be asked, Whence has He this power? the answer may be found in another place, where the apostle says: "Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body."³ The implied truth is that

¹ *Rom.* xiii. 13.

² *Gal.* v. 23.

³ *1 Cor.* vi. 20. Note the *δὴ* after *δοξάσατε*. It implies that to glorify God in

temperance, Christian sobriety and purity, not less than self-sacrifice, naturally spring out of the sense of redemption. They are a debt of honour we owe to Christ the Saviour of men.

Comparing the teaching of St. Paul with that of our Lord on the present topic, we find in both the doctrine that the Christian life begins with a decisive change, but expressed in different terms. In the Synoptical Gospels Jesus speaks of repentance and conversion, and in the Fourth Gospel the change of mind denoted by the words *μετάνοια, ἐπιστροφή* is figuratively described as a new birth. The apostle's name for the same experience is, as we have seen, a new creation. The name is well chosen to convey an idea of the greatness of the change, and on that account it commended itself to the mind of one whose experience amounted to nothing short of a mighty religious revolution. The phrase is the reflection of a momentous spiritual history. It was further welcome to the apostle as applicable not only to individual experience, but to the collective body of phenomena which owed their existence to the Gospel. Conscious of a new creation in himself, he also saw a new creation all around him, and he applied to it a title which was at once a claim and an argument for the recognition of a great and startling novelty. Finally, we cannot doubt that another recommendation of this name to him was the implied ascription of the revolution it denoted, whether in the individual or in the community, to God as its author. It was meant to suggest that He who at the beginning made the heavens and the earth, had in the end of the world uttered the fiat, let the new heavens and the new earth be. An express recognition of the creative causality of God in the apostle's own experience, occurs in the remarkable words of *2 Corinthians* iv. 6 : "It was the God who said, 'out of darkness let light shine,'

the body is the self-evident duty arising out of the consciousness of redemption.

who shined in our hearts, giving the illumination consisting in the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ.”

It is obvious that while well fitted to express the phenomenal aspect of the new life, as presenting to discerning eyes a great startling change, the figure of the new creation much less aptly than the figure of the new birth expresses the nature of that life and its relation to what went before. The latter figure conveys the thought that the new life is not a creation out of nothing, having no relation to antecedent conditions, but rather a manifestation in power of what was there before in germ, the divine element in human nature made dominant. This relation, so far from being suggested, might rather seem to be negated by the Pauline phrase.

The apostle, however, did not mean to deny the existence of a divine element in what theologians call the “natural” man. On the contrary he expressly recognises it in *Romans* vii. under the name *the law of the mind*.

2. We pass now to the second topic, viz., how far the idea of growth is recognised in the Pauline literature in connection with the Christian life. In the Synoptical presentation of Christ’s teaching the idea of growth in the kingdom of God is very strikingly and adequately stated in the parable of the blade, the green ear, and the ripe corn.¹ The thought therein suggested is that in the kingdom of God, as in the natural world, life is subject to the law of gradual development, proceeding towards the ultimate state of maturity by regular and well-defined stages, which must be gone through successively. It must be admitted, perhaps, not without a feeling of disappointment, that we search in vain for a similarly clear conception in the Pauline epistles. In none of these, not even in the later Christological epistles, can we discover any such distinct and significant recognition of a law of growth ; and if we confine our attention to the four

¹ Mark iv. 26-29.

leading epistles, we can find no sufficient ground for the assertion that St. Paul represents the Christian life as an organic process of growth. On the other hand, it would be going too far to say that in the Pauline mode of conceiving the matter the Christian life springs into existence complete from the first, undergoing no subsequent change, and needing none because fully answering to the ideal.¹ This view might indeed be held compatibly with the admission that there are texts which suggest another mode of regarding the matter. The theory of a new life complete from the first is not justified by experience ; it was not justified by St. Paul's experience any more than by ours. He found no perfect Christians in the churches to which he wrote letters ; very much the reverse. Hence the frequent occurrence of texts containing exhortations, encouragements, reproaches, threatenings, suggesting the idea that the new life is at first a rudimentary imperfect thing requiring improvement, a tendency rather than an attainment, a struggle rather than a victory achieved. Notwithstanding such passages, however, it has been maintained that the notion of a new life complete from the first is involved in some Pauline utterances, and a protest has been taken against attempts at harmonising the two sets of texts by the construction of a dogma of gradual sanctification, according to which regeneration should be merely the point of departure for the new life, to be followed by a progressive amelioration, an increasing power over the flesh. The Pauline ideal, it is contended, is a new life in Christ perfect from the first, a death to sin and a resurrection to holiness, accomplished not gradually but *per saltum*. If the reality fall short, the ideal is not to be sacrificed or lowered ; the reality is rather to be regarded as a fault to be corrected, the ideal being kept constantly before the eye in

¹ So Reuss in his *Theology of the Apostolic Age*. Pfeiderer takes the opposite view, at least in the first edition of *Paulinismus*. I have not noticed any modification of his opinion in the 2nd edition.

its uncompromising grandeur and unearthly beauty as a stimulous to the task of self-correction.¹

The one thing we seriously object to in this representation is the assumption that St. Paul regarded the Christian ideal as realizable at the outset. That he might invest the beginning of the Christian life with an ideal significance, representing it as a death to sin and a resurrection to a new life (ideas both excluding lapse of time), is very conceivable; that he did this in fact we believe. But that it was a surprise to him that nowhere did he find young Christians in whom the ideal significance of faith was fully realized, is not so easy to believe. It might have been a surprise to him when he was himself a young Christian, as it is apt to be to all beginners. For in the blossom of the new life Christians feel as if their spiritual being were already complete, and the advent of the green fruit is a surprise and a disappointment to them, and hence it is commonly construed wrongly as a mere lapse or declension. But twenty years' experience must surely have helped to correct such crude ideas, and taught the apostle to cherish moderate, sober expectations in reference to beginners, and to recognise, if not with full understanding of its rationale, at least virtually, that the divine life is not a momentary product, but a process, a problem to be worked out, an organic growth.

Such a conception accordingly we do find, though mainly in the later epistles. The exhortation, "work out your salvation," suggests the idea of a problem to be solved.² The comparison of the church to the human body growing up to the stature of manhood suggests the idea of organic growth.³ The metaphorical expression "rooted in love"⁴ suggests a comparison of the Christian life to a tree planted

¹ *Vide* Reuss' whole chapter on Regeneration in his account of the Pauline Theology (*Théologie Chrétienne*, vol. ii., p. 135).

² *Phil.* ii. 12.

³ *Eph.* iv. 11-15.

⁴ *Eph.* iii. 18.

in a good soil and growing from a small plant to the dimensions of a forest tree.

Rudimentary hints of a doctrine of growth are not wanting even in the four leading epistles. The idea of growth is clearly recognised in regard to humanity at large, if not in reference to the individual, in the comparison of the law to tutors and governors who have charge of an heir during the time of his minority.¹ The word *καρπὸς*, in the text where the apostle sets the *fruit* of the Spirit over against the *works* of the flesh,² readily suggests to us the idea of gradual growth, knowing as we do that ripe fruit is the slow product of time. Yet it is doubtful if this thought was present to the apostle's mind. Equally doubtful is it whether we are entitled to lay stress on the word "soweth" in the text: "He that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting,"³ as it is probable that the whole earthly life is here regarded as the seed time, the harvest falling in the life hereafter. The surest indication of a doctrine of growth in grace to be found in the Epistle to the Galatians is contained in v. 5, where the Christian is represented as waiting for the hope of righteousness. Assuming that the righteousness referred to is to be taken subjectively, we find in this text the idea that personal holiness is an object of hope and patient expectation. The ideal is thus projected into the future, and we are by implication taught not to fret because it is not at once realized. We are to wait for the realization of the ideal in a mature spiritual manhood, with the patience of a farmer waiting for the harvest, who knows that growth is gradual, there being first the blade, then the green ear, and only then the full corn in the ear.

Among the hints of a doctrine of growth in the other epistles belonging to the main group may be mentioned the following:—

In *1 Corinthians* the apostle describes the members of the

¹ *Gal.* iv. 1, 2.

² *Gal.* v. 22.

³ *Gal.* vi. 8.

church as *νήπιοι*, to whom he could give only milk,¹ while he claims to be in possession of a wisdom which he could teach to the more advanced, denominated *τέλειοι*.² But as showing that the full significance of the doctrine was not present to his mind, it has to be noted that he speaks of the infantile state of the Corinthian church as something blameworthy, associating with the epithet "babes" the attributes of unspirituality and carnality.³ The tone here is markedly different from that of the words put into the mouth of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now,"⁴ which tacitly recognise that spiritual children cannot be expected to have the understanding of spiritual men. It resembles rather the tone of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews when he complains of his readers as being destitute of manly intelligence, and like children having need of milk. Only there was this difference between the Corinthian and the Hebrew Christians, that the latter were in their second childhood—they had *become* as children, while the Corinthians were in their first childhood, and had only recently become converts to Christianity. Blame in the case of second childhood, spiritual dotage, was certainly called for; but ought not much allowance to be made for beginners?

In *2 Corinthians* iii. 18 the apostle represents Christians as undergoing transformation through contemplation of the glory of the Lord Christ. "We are being changed into the same image from glory to glory." The present tense suggests a process continually going on. The expression "from glory to glory" may also point to a steady gradual advance, though it may mean from glory in Him to glory in us.

In *Romans* vi. 14 the apostle remarks: "sin shall not reign over you, for ye are not under law, but under grace." This statement does not teach a doctrine of gradual sanctification, but it leaves room for it. Sin dethroned may still

¹ iii. 1.² ii. 6.³ iii. 1.⁴ *John* xvi. 12.

attempt to regain its lost sovereignty, and we know that when a change of dynasty takes place in a country there is generally a more or less protracted period of trouble during which members of the degraded royal family endeavour to get themselves restored to power. Sin dethroned therefore may continue to give trouble as a pretender. In the 12th chapter of the same epistle occurs this exhortation: "Be ye not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed in the renewal of the mind to the effect of your proving what is the will of God, the good, and acceptable and perfect." This transformation of character and this proving of the divine will so as to verify its characteristics, imply a gradual process, lapse of time, a thing done bit by bit, a progressive experience enlightening the mind in the knowledge of God's will, and bringing our life more and more into conformity with it. A process of growth is equally implied in the text v. 3, "We glory in tribulation, knowing that tribulation worketh out patience and patience attestation, and attestation hope." The working out of patience is a process involving time, and, what is still more to our present purpose, the result of the process, patience, and the consciousness of being tested and attested, whence come self-reliance and calm assurance, is something we could not possess antecedent to experience. That is to say, these are Christian virtues developed by the discipline of trial, which no beginner can possess.

The result of our enquiry, on the whole, is this: In the Pauline letters and especially the controversial group, there is no formulated doctrine of growth enunciated with full consciousness and deliberate didactic purpose. But there is a doctrine of growth latent in these letters; there are germs which we may use in the construction of such a doctrine. Moreover there are facts in the life of the churches alluded to in these letters which we may employ in verification of the doctrine, though not so used by the

apostle himself. For example: there is the lapse of the Galatian Church into legalism and of the Corinthian Church into various sorts of errors in opinion, and the party contentions prevailing therein, and there is the scrupulosity about meats and drinks spoken of in the Epistle to the Romans. We may use these phenomena as helping us to form a vivid idea of the characteristics of the green ear, or let us call it the stage of the crude fruit in the divine life, between the blossom and the ripe fruit. St. Paul dealt with these as *faults*. But are they not more than faults accidentally occurring, are they not phenomena which reappear regularly with all the certainty of a fixed law? As sure as after the blossom comes the green crude fruit come there not in the experience of Christians after the time of first enthusiasm is past, such features as these: joylessness, a religion of legal temper and mechanical routine, scrupulosity, opinionativeness, censoriousness, quarrelsomeness, doubt? Then, on the other hand, what is that spirit of adoption whose presence and influence within the churches to which he writes the apostle misses and so greatly desiderates, but one of the most outstanding characteristics of Christian maturity, of the stage of the ripe fruit in Christian growth, when a believing man at last begins to have some conception of the true character of the new life and some practical acquaintance with its blessedness? The advent of that spirit St. Paul viewed as the sign that the world at large, humanity, had arrived at its majority, and it is an equally sure sign of the arrival of the same important epoch in the spiritual life of the individual. Thus might we find valuable materials for the construction of a doctrine of gradual sanctification advancing through well-marked stages, not merely or even chiefly in the didactic statements of the apostle, but very specially in his complaints against and exhortations to the Churches to which he addressed his epistles.

3. The last point we proposed to consider refers to the salient features of the Christian character as conceived by St. Paul. Two of these, sobriety and devotion to Christ, have already been mentioned as among the moral phenomena of the new creation. To these has now to be added charity, *ἀγάπη*, which makes the list of the cardinal virtues in the Pauline ethical system tolerably complete. It might seem due to the prominence given to it in the first Epistle to the Corinthians that a fourth should be added to the number, viz., spiritual knowledge or insight. The apostle there claims for the pneumatical man as against the psychical, knowledge and appreciation of the things of the spirit of God.¹ Such knowledge he evidently regarded as an outstanding mark of distinction between the two classes of men, one of the prominent phenomena of the new creation. The man of the new creation knows the mind of God, the man who is outside this creation is not able to know. The psychical man has the five senses of the soul, but not the sixth sense of the spirit. Of this St. Paul was doubtless strongly convinced. Yet it would be contrary to the whole spirit of his teaching to mention anything of the nature of gnosis, even though it be spiritual gnosis, alongside of charity as if of co-ordinate importance. In the same epistle, further on, he expressly represents knowledge as of no account in comparison with charity. "If I know all mysteries and all knowledge and have not charity, I am nothing."² In another place he remarks, "knowledge inflates, charity edifies."³ The knowledge thus depreciated relates to divine things, but that does not prevent the apostle from assigning to it a place of secondary importance. Gnosis, theological gnosis especially, is very good in its own place, but it tends to make a man think more highly of himself than he ought. No fear of that in the

¹ 1 *Cor.* ii. 14, 15.

² 1 *Cor.* xiii. 2.

³ 1 *Cor.* vi i. 1.

case of love ; it builds up a solid structure of real, not imaginary, Christian worth.

Very significant of the sovereign place which ἀγάπη occupied in St. Paul's esteem is the fact that in his enumeration of the fruit of the Spirit he names it first,¹ not without a controversial reference to the religious contention which vexed the churches of Galatia. Yet charity, in the sense of love to the brethren, is not the absolute first for him. Devotion to Christ takes precedence. Witness the stern word : " if any one love not the Lord, let him be anathema." St. Paul's charity is great ; he loves weak brethren, and out of regard to their scruples denies himself the use of his Christian liberty.² He loves even those in the churches who regard him with distrust as a dangerous revolutionary, setting aside the divine law, changing venerable customs, as is shown by his diligence in making collection for the poor disciples in Jerusalem, though fully aware what hard thoughts they cherish regarding him there. His charity rises superior to party divisions and embraces all who belong to the Israel of God, strong or weak, Jew or Gentile, friendly or hostile to himself. He loves moreover all without, and yearns to do them good as he has opportunity, especially to bring to them the good tidings that they also may believe. But there is one class of men whom he can regard only with abhorrence : those who have had opportunity of knowing Jesus Christ, in His goodness, wisdom and grace, yet love Him not, but think and speak evil of Him. That for St. Paul was the unpardonable sin. He can love all but those who, knowing what they do, dislike Jesus. And in further proof that devotion to Jesus is the supreme virtue for him it may be added that he loves all men, but these, for Christ's sake. He considers the scruples of the weak because Christ died for them. He loves the poor in Jerusalem because, though

¹ Gal. v. 22.

² 1 Cor. viii 11, 13.

they distrust him, they are disciples of Jesus, though very imperfectly understanding His teaching. He loves the honest-minded among his opponents because they are fighting for what they consider to be the truth in Jesus. He loves the whole world because he believes all mankind have a place in Christ's Saviour-sympathies. It is not meant by these statements to insinuate that St. Paul exercised charity by calculation, and after deliberate reflection on motives. His Christianity was too vigorous and healthy for that. I mean that Christ had so possessed his soul as to become the inspiration of his whole life, the latent source of all his impulses, the supreme end of all his actions.

A. B. BRUCE.

*DEVOTION TO A PERSON THE DYNAMIC OF
RELIGION.*

NOTHING is easier than to create a religion ; one only needs self-confidence and foolscap paper. An able Frenchman sat down in his study and produced Positivism, which some one pleasantly described as Catholicism minus Christianity. It stimulated conversation in superior circles for years, and only yesterday Mr. Frederic Harrison was explaining to Professor Huxley that this ingenious invention of M. Comte ought to be taken seriously. An extremely clever woman disappeared into Asia and returned with another religion which has distinctly added to the innocent gaiety of the English nation. One never knows when a new religion may not be advertised. The Fabian Society is understood to be working at something, and each novelty receives a good-natured welcome. No person with any sense of humour resents one of these efforts to stimulate the jaded palate of society unless it be paraded a season too long and

threatens to become a bore. Criticism would be absurd: you might as well analyze *Alice in Wonderland*. Comparison with Christianity is impossible: it were an insult to Jesus.

The great religions of the East compel another treatment; one bows before them with wonder and respect. They are not the ephemera of fashion; they are hoar with antiquity. They are not the pastime of a coterie, they have shaped the destinies of innumerable millions. The most profound instinct of the soul breathes in their creeds and clothes itself in their forms, and notwithstanding their limitations and corruptions these ancient faiths have each made some contribution to the Race. One has anticipated the self-renunciation of Jesus, another has asserted the mystery of the eternal, a third has vindicated the unity of God, and a fourth has saturated with filial piety the future rivals of the West. It were unbelief in Divine Providence to deny those faiths a share in the development of humanity: it were inexcusable ignorance to regard them as systems of organized iniquity. They bear traces of noble ancestry, they preserve in their history a record of splendid service. Stricken by time, their ruins affect our imagination like the columns of Karnak. Dying at the heart, these worn-out religions still make more converts than Christianity. No reverent Christian will allow himself to despise the religions of the past; no intelligent Christian doubts that his will be the religion of the future. A child of the East, the religion of Jesus has conquered the West; conceived by a Galilean peasant, it has no limitations of thought or custom; with only a minority of the Race it embraces the dominant nations of the world. The mind of Jesus seems nothing more in the world as yet than a grey dawn; but wise men can see it is the rising sun.

The final test of any religion is its inherent spiritual dynamic: the force of Christianity is the pledge of its

success. It is not a school of morals, nor a system of speculation, it is an enthusiasm. This religion is Spring in the spiritual world, with the irresistible charm of the quickening wind and the bursting bud. It is a birth, as Jesus would say, a breath of God that makes all things new. Humanity does not need morals, it needs motives: it is sick of speculation, it longs for action. Men see their duty in every land and age with exasperating clearness. We know not how to do it.

“ Whom do you count the worst man upon earth,
 Be sure he knows, in his conscience, more
 Of what right is than arrives at birth
 In the best man's acts that we bow before.”

No one condemns the good, he leaves it undone. No one approves the evil, he simply does it. Our moral machinery is complete but motionless. The religion which inspires men with a genuine passion for holiness and a constraining motive of service will last. It has solved the problem of spiritual motion.

Jesus did not create goodness—her fair form had been already carved in white marble by austere hands; His office was to place a soul within the ribs of death till the cold stone changed into a living body. Before Jesus, goodness was sterile, since Jesus, goodness has blossomed; He fertilised it with His spirit. It was a theory, it became a force. He took the corn which had been long stored in the granaries of philosophy and sowed it in the soft spring earth; He minted the gold and made it current coin. Christianity is in Religion what steam is in mechanics, the power which drives. Jesus wrote nothing, He said little, but He did what He said and made others do as He commanded. His religion began at once to exist; from the beginning it was a life. It is the distinction of Christianity that it goes. This is why some of us, in spite of every intellectual difficulty, must believe Jesus to be the Son of

God—He has done what no other ever did, and what only God could do. He is God, because He discharges a “God-function.”

“’Tis one thing to know and another to practise,
And thence I conclude that the real God-function
Is to furnish a motive and injunction,
For practising what we know already.”

Religion with Jesus has a dynamic, and it is Jesus Himself, for Jesus and His religion are as soul and body. He did not evolve it as an intellectual conception, He exhibited it as a state of life. It was never a paper scheme like Plato's *Republic* or More's *Utopia*. Jesus' religion was in man before it appeared in the Gospels; it had been fulfilled in Himself before it was preached to the world. The Gospels are not only a programme, they are already a history. Christianity has been apt to sink into a creed or a ceremony—it is the decadence of Pharisaism—in Jesus' hand it was a life. Jesus never proposed that men should discuss His Gospel, He invited men to live it. “Whosoever cometh to Me, and heareth My sayings and doeth them . . . is like a man which built an house . . . on a rock” (St. Luke vi. 47, 48). He did not suggest lines of action, He commanded His disciples to do as He did. “Jesus . . . saw a man named Matthew sitting at the receipt of custom, and He saith unto him, Follow Me” (St. Matt. ix. 9). He did not dismiss His followers as pupils to a task, He declared that they would have a common life with Him. “Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the door of the sheep . . . by Me, if any man enter in, He shall be saved, and shall go in and out and find pasture” (St. John x. 7, 9). Jesus combines every side of religion in Himself, and is the sum of His Gospel. “I am the way, the truth, and the life” (St. John xiv. 6).

Jesus made a claim that separates Him from every other teacher—a claim of solitary and absolute infallibility. The

attitude of every other master has been modest and qualified. "This, I think, is true, but you must not believe it as my word; this, I think, is right, but you must not do it after my example. Examine and decide for yourselves. I am, like yourselves, a seeker and a sinner." Their disciples accepted this situation, and so Simmias said to Socrates, "We must learn, or we must discover for ourselves, the truth of these matters; or if that be impossible, we must take the best and most impregnable of human doctrines, and, embarking on that as on a raft, risk the voyage of life, unless a stronger vessel, some divine word, could be found on which we might take our journey more safely and more securely. . . . Cebes and I have been considering your argument, and we think that it is barely sufficient."

"I daresay you are right, my friend," said Socrates in the *Phaedo*.

Jesus did not affect such humility, nor make such admissions. He did not obliterate nor minimize Himself; He emphasized and asserted Himself. "Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time," opens one paragraph after another of Jesus' great sermon, and then it follows, "But I say unto you." Jesus brushes aside the ancients as if they had never been. His disciples were not to own any authority beside Him; He was to be absolute, with Apostles and Prophets only His witnesses and interpreters, never His equals. "Be not ye called Rabbi, for One is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren" (St. Matt. xxiii. 8). His words are ushered in with the solemn formula, "Verily, verily"; they fall on the inner ear like the stroke of a bell; they are independent of argument. It is ever "I," and one's soul answers with reverence. For this "I" that sounds from every sentence of the teaching of Jesus is not egotism; it is Deity.

Jesus makes the most unqualified demand on the loyalty of His disciples, and believes that the attraction of His

Person will sustain their obedience. The beginning of the religious life was no reception of dogma or dream of mysticism; it was to break up a man's former environment, and to follow the lead of Christ. "Believe in Me," and "Come unto Me," He was ever saying, as if it were natural to trust Him, impossible to resist Him. The hardness of religion had its compensations: it carried association with Jesus. "Whosoever will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow Me" (St. Mark viii. 34). The immense sacrifices of religion would be an office of love. "There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake" . . . (St. Mark x. 29). Religious cowardice was a synonym for treachery to Christ; it was a breach of friendship that could not be healed. "Whosoever shall be ashamed of Me and of My words, of him shall the Son of Man be ashamed when He shall come in His own glory, and in His Father's, and of the Holy angels" (St. Luke ix. 26). The slightest kindness was exalted into an act of merit, because it was inspired by devotion to Christ. "For whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink in my name, because ye belong to Christ, verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward" (St. Mark ix. 41). When Jesus came from the Father, the religious instincts were withering in the dust, and vainly feeling for something on which they could climb to God; Jesus presented Himself, and gathered the tendrils of the soul round His Person. He found religion a rite; He left it a passion.

Perhaps the most brilliant inspiration of Jesus was to fling Himself on the earliest, latest, strongest passion of our nature, and utilize it as the driving force of His religion. All our life from infancy to age we are in the school of love, and never does human nature so completely shed the slough of selfishness, or wear so generous a guise, or offer such

ungrudging service as under this sway. Here is stored to hand the latent dynamic for a spiritual enterprise; it only remains to make the connection. Do you wish a cause to endure hardness, to rejoice in sacrifice, to accomplish mighty works, to retain for ever the dew of its youth? Give it the best chance, the sanction of Love. Do not state it in books; do not defend it with argument. These are aids of the second order; if they succeed, it is a barren victory—the reason only has been won; if they fail, it is a hopeless defeat—the reason has now been exasperated. Identify your cause with a person. Even a bad cause will succeed for a space, associated with an attractive man. The later Stewarts were hard kings both to England and Scotland, and yet women sent their husbands and sons to die for “Bonnie Prince Charlie,” and the ashes of that romantic devotion are not yet cold. When a good cause finds a befitting leader, it will be victorious before set of sun. David had about him such a grace of beauty and chivalry that his officers risked their lives to bring him a cup of water, and his people carried him to the throne of Israel on the love of their hearts. Human nature has two dominant instincts—the spring of all action as well as the subject of all literature—Faith and Love. The religion which unites them will be omnipotent.

It was Jesus who summoned Love to meet the severe demands of Faith, and wedded for the first time the ideas of Passion and Righteousness. Hitherto Righteousness had been spotless and admirable, but cold as ice; Passion had been sweet and strong, but unchastened and wanton. Jesus suddenly identifies Righteousness with Himself, and has brought it to pass that no man can love Him without loving Righteousness. Jesus clothes Himself with the commandments, and each is transfigured into a grace. He illustrates His Decalogue in the washing of feet, and compels His disciples to follow His example. “If I then, your Lord and

Master, have washed your feet, ye ought also to wash one another's feet" (St. John xiii. 14). By one felicitous stroke He makes Love and Law synonymous, and Duty, which had always been respectable, now becomes lovely. It is a person, not a dogma, which invites my faith; a person, not a code, which asks for obedience. Jesus stands in the way of every selfishness; He leads in the path of every sacrifice; He is crucified in every act of sin; He is glorified in every act of holiness. St. Stephen, as he suffered for the Gospel, saw the heavens open and Jesus standing to receive him. St. Peter, fleeing in a second panic from Rome, meets Jesus returning to be crucified in his place. Conscience and heart are settled on Jesus, and one feels within his soul the tides of His virtue. It is not the doctrines nor the ethics of Christianity that are its irresistible attraction. Its doctrines have often been a stumbling block, and its ethics excel only in degree. The life blood of Christianity is Christ. As Louis said "I am the State," so may Jesus say "I am My Religion." What Napoleon was to his soldiers on the battle-field, Jesus has been to millions separated from Him by the chasm of centuries. No emotion in human experience has been so masterful, none so fruitful, as the passion for Jesus. It has inspired the Church, it has half saved the world.

Before Jesus could utilize this love He had to create it, and this was not accomplished either by His example or His teaching. The effect of His awful purity was terror: "Depart from me," said St. Peter, "for I am a sinful man, O Lord" (St. Luke v. 8). The result of three years' teaching was perplexity: an average apostle asked for a theophany: "Show us the Father, and it sufficeth us" (St. John xiv. 8). Holiness compels awe, wisdom compels respect; they do not allure. Nothing can create Life but Life; nothing can beget Love but Love. He that is not loved hates; he that is loved, loves, is a law of experience.

As the earth gives out the heat which it has received from the sun, so the devotion of Jesus' disciples to Him in all ages has been the return of His immense devotion to them. He lavished on His first disciples a wealth of love in His friendship; He sealed it with His sacrifice of Himself upon the cross. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends" (St. John xv. 13); "I am the good Shepherd: the good Shepherd giveth His life for the sheep" (St. John x. 11). Twelve men came into His intimacy; in eleven He kindled a fire that made them saints and heroes, and the traitor broke his heart through remorse, so he also must have loved. But Jesus expected that His love would have a wider range than the fellowship of Galilee, and that the world would yield to its spell. It was not for St. John, His friend, Jesus laid down His life; it was for the Race into which He had been born and which He carried in His heart. No one has ever made such a sacrifice for Humanity. No one has dared to ask such a recompense. The eternal Son of God gave Himself without reserve, and anticipated that to all time men would give themselves for Him. He proposed to inspire His Race with a personal devotion, and that profound devotion was to be their salvation. "Give Me a cross whereon to die," said Jesus, "and I will make thereof a throne from which to rule the world." The idea was once at least caught most perfectly in an early Christian gem, where, on a blood-red stone the living Christ is carved against His cross; a Christ with the insignia of His imperial majesty. Twice was Jesus' imagination powerfully affected—once by the horrors of the cross, when He prayed, "O My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from Me" (St. Matt. xxvi. 39); that was the travail of His soul—once by the magnetic attraction of the cross, when He cried, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me" (St. John xii. 32); this is the endless reward of His travail.

The passion for Jesus has no analogy in comparative religion; it has no parallel in human experience. It is a flame of unique purity and intensity. Thomas does not believe that Jesus is the Son of God, or that, more than any other man, He can escape the hatred of fanaticism; but he must share the fate of Jesus. "Let us also go," said this morbid sceptic, "that we may die with Him" (St. John xi. 16). At the sight of His face seven devils went out of Mary Magdalene; for the blessing of His visit, a chief publican gave half his goods to the poor. When a man of the highest order met Jesus he was lifted into the heavenly places and became a Christed man, whose eyes saw with the vision of Christ, whose pulse beat with the heart of Christ. Browning has nothing finer than "A Death in the Desert," wherein he imagines the love of St. John to Jesus. No power is able to rouse the apostle from his last sleep, neither words nor cordials. When one has a sudden inspiration: he brings the Gospel and reads into the unconscious ear,

"I am the resurrection and the life,"

with the effect of an instantaneous charm.

"Whereat he opened his eyes wide at once,
And sat up of himself and looked at us."

This man had leant so long on Jesus' bosom—some seventy years—that at the very sound of His words the soul of Jesus' friend came up from the shadow of death. It is the response of the flower of the Race to Jesus.

This Passion is placed beyond comparison, because it is independent of sight. St. Paul denies the faith that was once dear to him, and flung away the world that was once his ambition, to welcome innumerable labours and exhaust the resources of martyrdom, for the sake of one whom he had never seen, save in mystical vision, and formerly hated to the shedding of blood. Men were lit as torches in Nero's garden, and women flung to the wild beasts of the amphi-

theatre ; and for what ? For a system, for a cause, for a Church ? They had not enough knowledge of theory to pass a Sunday School examination ; they had no doctrine of the Holy Trinity, nor of the Person of Jesus, nor of His Sacrifice, nor of Grace. They died in their simplicity for Him “ Whom having not seen ye love,” and the name of the Crucified was the last word that trembled on their dying lips. With an amazing candour Jesus had warned His disciples : “ Ye shall be brought before governors and kings for My sake. . . . And ye shall be hated of all men for My name’s sake ” (St. Matt. x. 18–22). With a magnificent confidence Jesus encouraged His disciples, “ He that endureth to the end shall be saved. . . . Whosoever therefore shall confess Me before men, him will I confess also before My Father which is in heaven ” (St. Matt. x.). The warning and the promise were both fulfilled in the history of the disciples’ passion. “ Christianus sum,” confesses the martyr, and then the hoarse refrain, “ Christianus ad leonem.” But Perpetua sees a “ great ladder of gold reaching from earth to heaven,” and on its highest round stands the Good Shepherd ; while Satorus is brought to the throne of the Lord Jesus and “ gathered to His embrace.” “ Men,” says Leckie, “ seemed indeed to be in love with death. Believing they were the wheat of God, they panted for the day when they should be ground by the teeth of wild beasts into the pure bread of Christ.” Love of life and love of kin, fear of pain and fear of death, were powerless before this talisman “ For My sake.”

This sublime passion did not die with the sacrifice of the martyrs, a mere hysteric of Religion, for it has continued unto this day the hidden spring of all sacrifice and beauty in the Christian life. The immense superstitions of the Middle Ages were redeemed by the love of Jesus, radiant in the life of St. Francis, reflected from the labours of the “ Friends of God.” There was a glory over all the bitter

controversies of the sixteenth century, because on the one side piety desired a spiritual access to Jesus' Person; and on the other, piety longed for the comfort of His Real Presence. Both the excessive ceremonialism and the vulgar sensationalism, which are the two poles of modern religion, may be pardoned, because the High Churchman at his altar and the evangelist at the street corner are one in their utter devotion to Jesus. Not only has the best theology been fed by this spirit, so that Bonaventura, questioned regarding his learning, pointed to the crucifix, and the living hymnology been its incarnation, so that to remove the name of Jesus were to leave no fragrance, but all the vast and varied philanthropy of public Christianity and the sweet and winsome graces of private life have been the fruit of this unworldly emotion. "For My sake," has opened a new spring of conduct from which has flowed the heroism and saintliness of nineteen centuries. When Jesus founded His religion on personal attachment it seemed a fond imagination: the perennial vitality of Christianity has been His vindication.

This perpetual Passion in the hearts of His disciples implies the mystical presence of Jesus, who promised "A little while and ye shall not see Me, and again a little while and ye shall see Me, because I go to the Father" (St. John xvi. 16), and "Lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world" (St. Matt. xxviii. 20). The presence of the living Christ, the object of adoration and service, has been wonderfully realized by the mystics, and distinctly held forth in the sacraments, but it is apt to be obscured in the consciousness of the Church by two different influences. One is a mechanical theology which builds every act of Christ into the structure of a system till no virtue comes from the flowing garments of His life, because they are nothing but the grave clothes of a dead Lord. The other is an idealizing criticism which evaporates the Person of

Christ in His teaching and while it may leave us a master, certainly denies us a Lord. This were to cast Religion back on its former condition when it was either an invention of the scribes or the philosophers, and to barter the indescribable charm of Christianity to secure a creed or to disarm unbelief. It is to reduce the religion of Jesus to the impotence of Judaism or Confucianism: it is to sell Jesus again without the thirty pieces of silver.

Jesus' idea lifts Christianity above the plane of arid discussion and places it in the region of poetry, where the emotions have full play and Faith is vision. Theology becomes the explanation of the fellowship between the soul and Jesus. Regeneration is the entrance into His life, Justification the partaking of His Cross, Sanctification the transformation into His character, Death the coming of the Lord, Heaven His unveiled Face. Doctrines will be but moods of the Christ-consciousness; parables of the Christ-life. Suffering will be the baptism of Jesus and the drinking of His cup, and if every saint have not the stigmata on his hands and feet, he will at least, like Simon the Cyrenian, have the mark of the cross upon his shoulder. And service will be the personal tribute to Jesus, whom we shall recognise under any disguise, as his nurse detected Ulysses by his wounds, and whose Body, in the poor and miserable, will ever be with us for our discernment. Jesus is the leper whom the saint kissed, and the child the monk carried over the stream, and the sick man the widow nursed into health, after the legends of the ages of faith. And Jesus will say at the close of the day, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren ye have done it unto Me" (St. Matt. xxv. 40.)

We ought to discern the real strength of Christianity and revive the ancient Passion for Jesus. It is the distinction of our religion: it is the guarantee of its triumph. Faith may languish; creeds may be changed; churches may be

dissolved; society may be shattered. But one cannot imagine the time when Jesus will not be the fair image of perfection or the circumstances wherein He will not be loved. He can never be superseded; He can never be exceeded. Religions will come and go, the passing shapes of an eternal instinct, but Jesus will remain the standard of the conscience and the satisfaction of the heart, Whom all men seek, in Whom all men will yet meet.

JOHN WATSON.

“POWER ON THE HEAD.”

1 COR. XI. 10.

THIS passage has been the despair of interpreters. Much violence has been brought to bear upon it, both as respects text and translation. The puzzling word is *ἐξουσίαν*, which is translated “power” in the Authorised, and “authority” in the Revised Version. In the one translation the verse stands thus: “For this cause ought the woman to have power on (her) head because of the angels”; in the other it runs as follows: “For this cause ought the woman to have (a sign of) authority on her head, because of the angels.” Both are accompanied by a marginal annotation. The Authorised Version explains the expression “power” in these terms,—“That is, a covering, in sign that she is under the power of her husband; while the Revised, dropping this explanation, suggests for “have a sign of authority on,” “have authority over”—words which certainly do not elucidate, but rather add to the enigma suggested by the verse.

In these circumstances, it is not surprising that many efforts have been made to get rid of the term *ἐξουσίαν* altogether, or to give it quite a different turn by the insertion of the word *οὐκ* before *ὀφείλει*. Heinrici mentions that Valkenaer proposed thus to alter the text, so as to bring out

the meaning,—“Non debet uxor habere sive exercere in maritum potestatem”—“the wife ought not to have or exercise power over her husband (head).” The various other conjectural emendations of ἐξουσίαν are given as follows by Dean Stanley in his note on the passage: “(1) ἐξουβίαν, a supposed Latinism for ‘exuviae.’ (2) ἐξουσίαν, a supposed derivative of ἔξις, ‘a habit,’ or a mistranslation of ‘habitum,’ on the hypothesis that the Epistle was written in Latin. (3) ἐξιοῦσα, ‘when she goes out.’ (4) ἐξ οὐσίας, ‘according to her nature.’ (5) ἐξουσία, ‘the woman who is the glory of man.’ (6) καυσίαν, ‘a broad-brimmed Macedonian hat.’ (7) a Grecised form of the Hebrew word ‘cesooth,’ ‘casooi’—‘a covering.’¹”

In like manner, many efforts have been made to get rid of the reading, or the rendering, in the remaining clause of the verse,—“because of the angels.” Instead of the words διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους, it has been proposed to read, (1) διὰ τὰς ἀγέλας, “on account of the crowds,” or ‘herds’; (2) διὰ τοὺς ἀγελαίους, “on account of the men who crowded in” (Stanley, or, as Heinrici gives it, “on account of the drivers of cattle”—*Viehtreiber*); (3) διὰ τοὺς ἄνδρας, “on account of the (staring) men”; (4) διὰ τοὺς ἐγγελασπᾶς, “on account of the mockers”; (5) διὰ τῆς ἀγγελίας, “throughout (the whole of) her (divine) message” (Stanley, or, as Heinrici more simply explains it, “throughout the preaching” *während der Predigt*); (6) διὰ τοὺς ὄχλους, “on account of the mobs”; while some critics, like Baur, have preferred to discard the words altogether, as a gloss which has been introduced into the text. Others, again, while retaining the words as they stand, have proposed peculiar renderings of διὰ or ἀγγέλους, such as (1) “on account of the bishops or rulers”; (2) “on account of the spies sent to watch the assemblies”; (3) “on account of the messengers sent by the

¹ A number of other explanations may be seen in Meyer (*in loc.*), but none of them seem worth discussion, and the above may serve as specimens.

bridegroom, to see the bride before marriage”; (4) as an adjuration “by the angels” (διά for νή); (5) “on account of divorces”—as a translation of the Latin term “nuntius” for a bill of divorce.

But all these conjectures and emendations must be set aside as utterly groundless. There is not the slightest doubt that both text and translation are perfectly correct as commonly given. We must face the words just as they stand,—“For this cause ought the woman to have power (or ‘authority’) on her head, because of the angels,” and endeavour, as we best may, to reach their true explanation.

The opening words of the verse, *διὰ τοῦτο*, refer us to the immediately preceding context. And when we glance at it, we find that, from the second verse of the chapter onwards, the Apostle is establishing a certain fact, and then applying it to a practical purpose. The fact which he brings into a clear light is that, with respect to order, woman is subordinate to man. It is important to observe that St. Paul’s reasonings on this point do not at all imply any *essential* inferiority in woman. They merely bring out the fact that, with reference to the sexes, as indeed throughout the universe, a certain *order* prevails, which must be duly regarded and maintained. This is a favourite thought of the Apostle, and one which he earnestly presses upon these tumultuous Corinthians. God, he reminds them, can never countenance any approach to “confusion” (*ἀκαταστασία*, chap. xiv. 33). He carries this idea of relation even into the sacred circle of the Godhead. “I would have you know,” he says, ver. 3, “that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God.” No disparagement, then, is meant as respects woman, when she is shown to be subordinate to man in the relation existing between the sexes. The order is—man first, woman second—man, the glory of God, woman, the glory of man—but both alike necessary to each

other, and both alike dependent upon God (ver. 12, ὡσπερ γὰρ ἡ γυνὴ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρός, οὕτως καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ διὰ τῆς γυναικός, τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ). Such is the Divinely appointed order here insisted upon by the Apostle.

The fact, then, being established, that in the scale of creation woman is subordinate to man, what, let us next enquire, is the practical purpose to which that fact is here applied by St. Paul? It is to the correction of one of the many abuses which had arisen in the Church at Corinth. Some professing Christians in that city, apparently acting upon the great truth set forth by the Apostle in another passage (Gal. iii. 28) that in Christ Jesus there is "neither male nor female," the sexes being on a footing of perfect equality as respects all spiritual privileges, had deemed themselves warranted in laying aside one of the most distinctive marks by which, in regard to dress, man and woman were discriminated from each other.

In itself, of course, costume has no ethical importance. Dress is a purely conventional thing; so that, what is deemed seemly and fitting in one country, may be considered utterly unbecoming in another. But nature herself suggests that the sexes should be marked out from each other by the style of clothing which is adopted; and, for manifestly wise purposes, a special precept had been given in the Mosaic law to that effect. We read at Deuteronomy xxii. 5,—“A woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment: for whosoever doeth these things is an abomination unto the Lord thy God.” On mere general grounds, therefore, and simply from that concern which he always showed for what was orderly and proper, the Apostle would undoubtedly have condemned that abuse which, in regard to this matter, had sprung up in the Corinthian Church.

But far more than this was involved in the innovation which had taken place. We may perhaps be surprised, at

first, to find St. Paul making use of such warm and emphatic language, in denouncing the practice which had evidently been reported to him from Corinth. “Every man,” he says (ver. 4), “praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoureth his head. But every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled, dishonoureth her head.” In order to understand these words, we require to know that, among many ancient nations, a covering on the head was regarded as *a symbol of subjection*. The veil referred to might be either natural or artificial; that is, it might consist of the human hair, or of any wrought covering placed upon the head. With respect to the veil furnished by nature, in the case especially of women, Milton, with his usual accuracy and beauty, tells us of what it was the emblem, when he says respecting Eve in Paradise,—

“She, as a veil, down to the slender waist
Her unadorned golden tresses wore
Dishevelled, but in wanton ringlets waved,
As the vine curls her tendrils, which *implied*
Subjection.”

With respect, again, to an artificial covering, we may regard it as pretty certain that *subjection* is the root-idea involved in the use of the Latin verb *nubo* to denote marriage on the part of a woman. That verb properly means “to put on a veil,” and the act of veiling seems to have indicated that the woman then came, as the Romans expressed it, *in manum mariti*—became entirely subject to her husband. Hence the sarcasm in the epigram of Martial,—

“Uxorem quare locupletem ducere nolim
Quæritis? uxori *nubere* nolo meæ.”—

—“Do you ask why I am unwilling to marry a rich wife? I do not wish to *veil myself* to my wife”—in other words, I

shrink from placing myself *in subjection* to her for the sake of her money.

We can now clearly understand the Apostle's words. He has said that "the head of every man is Christ." If then any man either wears long hair (ver. 14), or appears in the religious assembly with his head covered (ver. 4), he appears as if subjecting himself to the woman, and thus dishonoureth his head, Christ, to whom alone he is subordinate. If, on the other hand, a woman present herself in public uncovered, wilfully destitute either of her natural veil, which is her "glory" (ver. 15), or of that artificial covering which indicates subordination to her husband, she dishonoureth her head, the man, as claiming an equality with him, contrary to the Divine arrangement. And, in that case, says St. Paul, she has cast off the modesty that ought to be characteristic of her sex, and has in principle identified herself with those disreputable women, whose heads were shaven or shorn in token of the infamy they had contracted.¹

Now, after all this, what should we expect to be the summing up of the Apostle in verse 10? Probably the very opposite of what we find. "For this cause," says St. Paul, "ought the woman to have *authority* upon her head," whereas we naturally look for some such statement as the following,—“For this cause ought the woman to have an *emblem of subjection* on her head.” Here, however, the commentators crowd upon us with their explanations and illustrations; and let us listen to what they have to tell us in connection with the remarkable language of the Apostle.

We are informed, then, that when St. Paul says "authority" he means "*a sign of authority.*" It is not

¹ Tacitus suggests the disgraceful nature of the deeds for which cutting off the hair was in use among the ancients, when he tells us (*Germania*, ch. 19) that female adulterers among the Germans had their hair cut off—*accisis crinibus*—before being subjected to other punishments.

unusual, we are reminded, to meet with such a metonymy. An example is brought forward from Diodorus Siculus, who speaks (i. 47) of a certain image as “having three kingdoms on its head”—ἔχουσαν τρεῖς βασιλείας ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς—where the word “kingdoms” is manifestly used for *symbols* of power. Again, we are referred to Numbers vi. 7, where we read in the Greek version of the LXX.—εὐχὴ Θεοῦ ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ—“a vow of God,” that is, “the *sign* of a vow of God is upon his head.” Heinrici (*in loc.*) takes note of several other examples.

Most commentators are content to rest in this explanation. A few, indeed, have thought that the term ἐξουσία has itself sometimes the meaning of “a veil,” and should be so rendered in this passage. If this could be proved, perhaps the best of all explanations would be offered. But nothing at all satisfactory has been found to justify such a translation of the word. It is true that Irenæus, in quoting the passage (*Adv. Haer.*, i. 8, 2, *Mass.*) substitutes κάλυμμα for ἐξουσίαν, and that the Latin translator naturally represents it by *velamen*. That, however, only proves what meaning Irenæus found in the passage, and cannot be regarded as showing that ἐξουσία sometimes meant¹ “a veil.” In fact, no modern commentator so understands it, but all accept the explanation already suggested. Dean Stanley, for instance, thus states the opinion in which he and others acquiesce,—“It remains to suppose that the Apostle uses the phrase to signify ‘the symbol of a man’s power over the woman, as expressed in the covering of the head.’”

This may really be the only interpretation of the passage possible; but it certainly appears very harsh and unsatisfac-

¹ Harvey thinks (*Irenæus*, i. 69) that, through the Syriac version, it can be shown that ἐξουσία might mean “a veil,” and his learned note is well worth consideration. But, whatever might be true of the equivalent Syriac term, I am afraid no evidence can be produced that the Greek word in question ever had the meaning of κάλυμμα.

tory. It labours, in fact, under the disadvantage of making the Apostle say the very opposite of what he *seems* to say. His words, literally rendered, are,—“A woman ought to have authority on her head,” while the gloss put upon them is, “A woman ought to have a sign of her husband’s authority on her head.” And let it be noted that among all the illustrations of such metonymy which have been adduced, there is not a single one parallel to this. As has been well remarked by Stanley, “this use of the name of the thing signified for the symbol, though natural where the power spoken of belongs to the person, would be unnatural when applied to the power exercised over that person by some one else.” Meyer, indeed, remarks that “here the *connection* justifies the use of ἐξουσία to denote the sign of *another’s* power”; but this seems hardly a sufficient answer to Hofmann, who objects that the word is thus really “twisted into an opposite meaning.” Nor have other able writers, in my humble judgment, succeeded in removing the difficulty which is involved in the above consideration. May I, then, venture to look at this perplexing word ἐξουσίαν in a totally different light? I would beg, with much diffidence, to suggest that it should be viewed not as referring to the man at all, but as bearing only upon the woman. And if any tolerable sense can be brought out of the expression when thus regarded, it need not be said that most of the harshness will disappear which is inseparable from the other interpretation.

“The woman,” says St. Paul, “ought to have authority upon her head”; and, taking these words in their plain grammatical sense, the authority spoken of can belong only to the woman. What, then, are we to understand by this “authority”? Plainly, nothing else can be meant than the *rightful claim* which the woman, in her proper place, has to influence and honour.

It is supposed that she has accepted her God-assigned

position of subordination to the man; and then, by the language which the Apostle adopts, the thought is suggested that she has thus secured a dignity and power which could not have been acquired by any foolish attempt at independence. St. Paul might have expressed himself differently. He might have said,—“For this cause the woman ought to have a veil upon her head”; and we should probably have expected some such turn to be given to his words. But he chose rather to say instead,—“For this cause ought the woman to have *authority* on her head,” with the view of suggesting that the very emblems of submission, which a God-fearing woman bears on her person, really become to her elements of power. That artificial veil, which she was enjoined to wear, in contradistinction from the man, would, as a symbol of her modesty and meekness, add to her attractiveness and influence. And that natural covering with which she had been furnished—the long hair which, as the Apostle says, was truly her “glory”—would increase immensely the graces of her person. As Archbishop Trench has remarked regarding woman,—“Long beautiful tresses have evermore been held as her chiefest adornment,” and he aptly quotes, in illustration, that line of the Latin poet,—

“*Quod primum formae decus est, cecidere capilli.*”¹

Thus, the very types of her subjection became the instruments of her “authority”; and, in showing obedience to Him “whose service is perfect freedom,” she acquired a dignity and power which could not otherwise have been attained. This view of the passage seems to me greatly to soften and beautify the language here used by the Apostle respecting woman. He has often been accused of treating the weaker sex with undue severity. It has been said that the position he assigns woman savours more of an Oriental

¹ *Notes on the Parables*, p. 290.

and despotic, than of a chivalrous or Christian spirit. But, if we may regard him as here claiming "authority" for woman in her proper relation to man, such a charge will lose much of its apparent force. It will then be seen that the sexes are represented by St. Paul as each possessed of its own special dignity and power, so that the Apostle's language will be in accord with these well-known and beautiful words—

"As unto the bow the cord is,
So unto the man is woman:
Though she bends him, she obeys him,
Though she draws him, yet she follows,
Useless each without the other."

No mere translation could, of course, bring out the full meaning of the passage, as suggested above. That must be left to the *viva voce* explanations of any preacher who may be inclined to adopt the view I have ventured to present. Only in accepting it the pen must be drawn through these words—"a sign of," which have been inserted in the Revised Version, and the clause must simply stand thus,—
"For this cause ought the woman to have authority on her head."¹

It does not seem to me that the remaining clause of the verse—"because of the angels"—ought to cause much difficulty. No reference, I think, should be supposed to Genesis vi. 2, though this opinion has been held by writers both ancient and modern (Tertullian, Stanley). The thought suggested by the Apostle simply is, that the holy angels are present in the religious assemblies of Christians,

¹ Since writing the above, I have been pleased to find that among more recent interpreters, the late Bishop Wordsworth, of Lincoln, held that *ἐξουσίαν* refers to the woman herself. He says (*in loc.*) "She ought to have a badge of her own dignity and power on her head." Some of the older expositors seem also to have taken this view. See Meyer *in loc.* But I am not aware of having followed any one in the exegesis which I have suggested.

and that remembrance of this fact should have a deterrent power over those persons who might be tempted into lawless or disorderly conduct. These ideas are quite in harmony both with the angelology of Scripture, and the innate feelings of the human heart. We are told respecting the angels that they are deeply interested in the work of redeeming love (1 Peter i. 12), and that they act the part of "ministering spirits" to the heirs of salvation (Heb. i. 14). Nothing, therefore, could be more fitting than that they should be spoken of as present with Christians in their worship of God.

Then, again, it is a well-recognised sentiment of human nature that the presence of superiors tends to restrain from anything unseemly or improper; and the vivid recollection that celestial beings were in their midst, though unseen, could not fail to have such an effect on Christian worshippers. St. Paul in another passage (Col. ii. 5) speaks of himself as being spiritually present in the far-distant gatherings of his Christian brethren, and as joying in beholding the "order" which there prevailed. And, if this were the case with him, doubtless the blessed angels must feel a similar joy in contemplating seemliness and propriety in the Churches of Christ, while they would be correspondingly distressed on perceiving any contrary behaviour. It was then a lofty no less than a tender argument, which was thus employed by the Apostle; and it could not fail to impress and influence his readers just in proportion to the spiritual susceptibility of which they were severally possessed.

A. ROBERTS.

RECENT GERMAN LITERATURE ON THE OLD
TESTAMENT.

I. BUDDÉ'S TRANSLATION OF KUENEN'S ESSAYS.

UPON the Old Testament no more useful work has recently appeared than Professor Budde's translation of a number of Kuenen's treatises.¹ Students of all lands will welcome the collection into one volume, in the classic language of criticism, of essays, which, while they form a necessary supplement to Kuenen's larger works, and are most of them landmarks in the history of Old Testament science, afford at the same time so high an example of scholarship, on both its moral and intellectual sides. Professor Budde's own fitness for the work of selecting and translating these essays out of three languages and many periodicals is amply assured, on the one side by his eminence as an Old Testament critic, on the other by his long friendship with Kuenen and his previous translation of the latter's work. An English reviewer cannot, of course, give a final judgment on a translation into German; yet he can testify that he finds Professor Budde's translation everywhere clear and intelligible. The reader has but to compare the text, with the quotations inserted in it from German authors (such as that on p. 407), to see how it has preserved throughout the order and lucidity of the original.

In his preface Dr. Budde recites the chief facts of Kuenen's career, and reprints the tribute to his qualities as a man and a scholar, which appeared last year in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, and which was concentrated in the striking phrase: Kuenen "stand auf seiner Warte wie das Gewissen der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft." "Kuenen," runs another paragraph, "was no genius . . . his strength lay in the harmonious proportion of his gifts. A fine feeling for language, critical insight, æsthetic gifts, the historical sense, a religious disposition — each was lavishly represented in him, and hardly one overtopped another to such a degree as to injure it. But all these talents were held together by an incorruptible conscientiousness, and a magnificent

¹ *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur Biblischen Wissenschaft*, von Dr. Abraham Kuenen, weiland Professor zu Leiden: aus dem Holländischen Uebersetzt von K. Budde. Mit Bildniss u. Schriftenverzeichniss. Freiburg i. B. u. Leipzig. J. C. B. Mohr, 1894.

impulse to the search for truth. It is, above all, these ethical qualities which Kuenen has to thank for his results. What distinguishes his works is thoroughness of method. A collection of material as perfect as possible; in investigation the greatest calmness and circumspectness; an objectiveness and impartiality of judgment which has hardly its equal; almost infallible correctness as to the range of each conclusion; a working up of his material to the last remnant. The degrees of probability are distinguished most conscientiously and the reader may confidently trust to this, that he will never be misled by any personal partiality of the author. Kuenen's essays remain for all times examples of critical work, as Lessing's have stood till to-day."

These remarks are true. No better justification of them could be given than the reviews which Dr. Budde has selected for the third part of this volume. They are mostly criticisms of opponents, and replies to attacks made on Kuenen himself. Throughout they are distinguished by fairness of representation, patience of treatment and sweetness of temper. In all these monuments of years of controversy there is nothing unjust or unworthy; nothing impatient even when the opponent is a Maurice Vernes or a Havet. Some critics have their positions more lucidly stated than they have ever stated them themselves; in fact, articles 9, 10 and 11-14 form a most admirable history of recent criticism on the course of Israel's religious development. Similarly, the more positive essays in the second part of the volume reveal the thoroughness of method and impartiality of judgment which Dr. Budde emphasises. His phrase, therefore, that Kuenen was "the conscience of Old Testament science" is not exaggerated. And one says this the more heartily, that one is not always convinced by Kuenen's arguments, and especially feels that the quiet temperament of the man, to which he owed so much of his power and charm, prevented him from appreciating to the full some traits in the temperament of the extraordinary people, to the elucidation of whose history he devoted his career, as well as from feeling the difficulties that many other critics at the present day feel as to his lucid and powerful theory of Israel's development. Let this be, however: we must all thank Professor Budde for the emphasis he lays upon the Dutch scholar's moral greatness. With so much spoiling of critical work, both in Germany, France and our own land, through over-ingenuity,

arbitrariness and self-consciousness, Professor Budde's noble preface is very necessary.

The principle of selection followed by Professor Budde is admirable. He has rejected all the earlier reviews in the *Theol. Tijdschrift*, whose results have been practically absorbed in Kuenen's greater works. On the other hand, he has included the six lectures which Kuenen contributed between 1866 and 1890 to the Dutch Academy of Science, and which comprise, besides the famous essay upon "The Men of the Great Synagogue," others on "The Composition of the Sanhedrim," "The Pedigree of the Massoretic Text," "Hugo Grotius as an Expositor of the Old Testament," "The *Melecheth* of Heaven" in Jeremiah and "The Chronology of the Persian Period of Jewish History." From periodicals have been selected reviews published since 1885, the date of the new edition of the *Onderzoek*. These are mainly Kuenen's replies to criticisms of his theory of Israel's religion and history, or criticisms of fresh adventures in that inexhaustible field. One is devoted to an entertaining review of Pierson and Naber's *Verisimilia*. With the papers on the "Composition of the Sanhedrim," and on "The Men of the Great Synagogue," it gives the volume a claim on the attention also of New Testament scholars. The bulk of the reviews, however, consist of criticism of that theory of the Composition of the Hexateuch, which at the present time is the only real rival to the theory of Kuenen and Wellhausen. Vatke (latterly), Dillmann, Bandissin and Kittel place the priestly legislation, or the bulk of it, before the exile: and here we have Kuenen's final replies to them. That alone proves the volume an indispensable sequel to his great works. In another article we have his reply (from the *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*) to Halevy's article on Ezra in the same periodical. In another Vernes and Havet, those anarchists of criticism, are severely but justly condemned. Renan as a historian is happily characterised in a review of Vol. I. of his *Histoire*, and Baethgen's *Beiträge zur Sem. Religionsgeschichte* is, with due appreciation of its learning, adversely criticised as to its theories of a primitive monotheism, whether in Israel or other Semitic nations. The whole volume is prefaced by a translation of Kuenen's two articles in the *Modern Review* for 1880 on "The Critical Method," in which he applied Sybil's great maxims to Biblical Criticism.

These criticisms, defences and arguments do not of course

always win the adherence of those who heartily admit the truth of Dr. Budde's estimate of their moral and intellectual qualities. For example, though agreeing with much that Kuenen advances against Baethgen, I do not think all his arguments are valid. The last of them is not so; the mixture of Israel with foreign elements after the settlement in western Palestine surely heightens the possibility that Israel's religion was originally purer than it afterwards became, and that, in spite of polytheistic practices, throughout the subsequent centuries there might still run strong the native feeling that for Israel Jahveism alone was legitimate. Dr. Kuenen also omits from his argument all regard of the religious effects of the passage from nomadic to agricultural life. From its very nature this must have caused at once a greater complexity in religion and a decline in moral simplicity, and we find the strongest tradition of this throughout the Old Testament. There are also points on which Dr. Kuenen seems to avoid coming to an issue with his opponents. When he complains, for instance, on p. 450, "in the interests of science," that his theory of a "geradlinige Entwicklung" of Israel's religion has been condemned by those who explain the difference of Israel from other Semitic peoples by "a continuous Divine guidance and Divine revelation," how glad we would have been to have him state in all his lucidity the differences between himself and his opponents, and how he proposed to explain that uniqueness of Israel's faith, which critics as scientific as himself, and after adopting his theory of the order of Israel's literature, have been unable to account for except by Divine revelation.

I am reviewing, however, not Kuenen, but this collection and translation of his essays. From what has been said, it will be seen that they form an indispensable supplement to his larger works—a supplement that could not have been better arranged and presented to the public. Attached to the volume is a fine portrait of Dr. Kuenen; and Professor van Manen adds a catalogue of all Kuenen's works which have appeared in print.

II. BENZINGER'S "HEBRÄISCHE ARCHÄOLOGIE."¹

The "Grundriss der Theologischen Wissenschaften" Series has received an important addition in a volume on *Hebräische Archäologie*, by Dr. J. Benzinger, Repetent at the Protestant

¹ Freiburg und Leipzi, J. C. B. Mohr.

Seminar in Tübingen. It was Dr. Benzinger who, after a prolonged journey in Syria, edited the last German edition of Baedeker's *Palestine*, and he is known to readers of the *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* as a valuable contributor of reviews and independent papers. One turns, therefore, with confidence to the first part of this volume, in which he deals with the Land and People of Palestine. Of the disposition of Palestine, and of its relations to other lands, of its climate and products, he gives us an admirable sketch — lucid, comprehensive, and with full references to Scripture. I notice the following wants. Trelawney Saunders' *Survey of Western Palestine* ought certainly to have been mentioned among the literature on the general geography of the land. It is far more detailed and thorough than Ankel's able sketch; in fact, it is the one complete study of the surface of the country. Again, the geological formation of Syria might be more accurately described than as a single "limestone plateau," torn into different parts by powerful fractures of which the most important is the Jordan Valley and its continuations north and south. Syria, according to most geologists, was rather formed by the uprising of two immense folds of limestone, the hollow between which, further deepened by an enormous fracture, is the Ghor. Ankel's hint, quoted on p. 17, that the Jordan Valley is an unsuccessful attempt of Nature to extend the Mediterranean eastward and south-eastward, is misleading, and the proofs of the primeval continuity of the Western Range across Esdraelon are not noticed. Also misleading is the sentence (p. 19) that the Western Range stands in the closest connexion geologically with the Sinaitic peninsula. The fact is that they are separated, as the text notices, by a deep depression, and that the bulk of the so-called Sinai Range is of a very different and much older geological formation. On p. 18 the contrast between Eastern and Western Palestine, as respectively pastoral and agricultural, ought to have been strongly qualified. Over Jordan there are districts as richly and characteristically agricultural as any in the west. After the evidence I have brought forward in my *Hist. Geog.* for the limits of the Shephelah, I cannot agree with the statement on p. 21 that the Shephelah is the Philistine Plain, and that some writers include within it "den unteren Teil des Westabhanges des judäischen Gebirges." This last clause is as erroneous geographically as Siegfried-Stade's description of the Shephelah as the

“westliche Abdachung” of the Judæan Range. The fact is the low Shephelah hills are separated from the Judæan range by a distinct and continuous valley: orographically they are an independent group of hills; they appear to be also geologically distinct. Again, the very great majority of references to the Shephelah in the Bible and Apocrypha carefully distinguish it from the Philistine Plain. Conder, I think, was the first to suggest the difference. In the Jordan Valley irrigation is more possible than Dr. Benzinger believes; no one who has travelled along the base of the Gilead range, and seen the many streams which burst from this, as well as the remains of old aqueducts, can doubt the practicableness of the irrigation of the most of the eastern Ghor, while the height of the Lake of Galilee above all to the south of it, and the rapid fall of the Jordan itself suggest a more elaborate scheme of water-works that might render this long “forcing house of vegetation” fertile in its entire extent. In the description of the coast, the remarkable effect of currents, winds and Nile-mud in closing up the petty harbours is not noticed. It is stated that the daily sea-wind reaches Jerusalem not till two or three in the afternoon: but in Hauran we used to feel it before noon.

Upon the masterly sketch of the topography of Jerusalem there is nothing but praise to be bestowed. Its lucidity, comprehensiveness and reserve are equally admirable. Chapter II. of the First Part deals first with the prehistoric inhabitants of Canaan and their rude stone monuments, then with the races Israel found in the country, and then with the name, origin and development of Israel themselves. For Israel’s predecessors and neighbours, Pietschmann’s *Geschichte der Phönicier* is largely drawn upon. Very little is said about the origin of Israel: M. Benzinger merely describes them as a nomadic tribe who had lived on the Egyptian border, without benefiting appreciably from the Egyptian civilisation, tore themselves free, settled for a time in the Sinaitic peninsula, were preserved in wonderful loyalty to their national god, came for unknown reasons to Syria, drifted across Jordan, and won western Palestine, not so much by war as by peaceful methods. They were distinguished from the first by a more developed religion than the Canaanites, and by a far more strenuous morality.

In the second part of the volume Dr. Benzinger treats of the archæology of private life, foods, clothes, dwellings, villages and

towns, family life and society, coins and weights, trades and commerce, art and letters. This part is crammed full of information. We desiderate only more detailed information about the trade-routes. (The description on a previous page, 44, of Jerusalem as the place at which the road from the sea to eastern Palestine and the road from north to south crossed each other is surely wrong, for the main line of trade from Philistia to the Jordan Valley crossed the south and north road some miles to the north of Jerusalem.) In his paragraph on the *Alphabet*, which is otherwise full, Dr. Benzinger says nothing of the theory of an Arabian origin, among the Minæans. The third part is occupied with political antiquities—the tribal constitution, the monarchy and the criminal law; the fourth with the antiquities of religion and worship—the priests, sacrifices, festivals and ceremonial cleanness. This reminds us that one great omission is a detailed treatment of diseases; except for some remarks in connexion with the climate and the treatment of ceremonial uncleanness, we have nothing. We are not told about the boils on the Philistines in 1 Samuel v., or the *sore sicknesses of Egypt*, or the *Boil of Egypt*, or Job, or the Plague. This is a great want.

Among the general merits of the work are its comparative method, its very full references to Scripture, and its numerous illustrations. We have, I think, for the first time in a work on Biblical archæology, an adequate treatment of the Semitic spirit and culture in general; while Egyptian, Phœnician, Assyrian and Hittite sources are liberally drawn upon. It is no drawback that so few of the illustrations are original; they are the best of their kind. Petrie's photographs of the Egyptian ethnological sculptures as reproduced by Sayce; sketches of monuments from the documents of the English and German Palestine Societies from Layard and Ermann; buildings, pottery, and seals from Perrot and Chipiez, and Petrie; coins from Madden and others; costumes from Weiss. The plan of ancient Jerusalem is original: the map of the land is the admirable one by Fischer and Guthe. The whole forms a volume of very great value, both to the teacher and student of the Bible.

III. SOME OTHER WORKS.

Palestina u. Syrien von Anfang der Geschichte bis zum Siege des Islam, by E. Starck, Pastor at Leusson in Mecklenburg-Schwerin,¹

¹ Berlin: Reuther und Reichard, 1894.

is a concise geographical lexicon designed to assist not only students of the Bible and Josephus, but those of the Latin and Greek classics, and all readers who desire to follow intelligently the progress of geographical exploration in Syria. Within the space which the author has allowed himself this has been well done. The book is 167 pages: it is a pity it is not 300. Whenever the author goes into detail, as for instance in his seven-page article on Jerusalem, he is satisfactory. Elsewhere a few lines added under each of the more important headings would have vastly increased the value of the work; and a very little more study, the results of which would have required very little more space for expression, would have enabled him to include the Crusades and make his review of the historical geography practically complete. As it is, the book should prove of great use to students. Subjects like Decapolis, Shephelah, Galilee, the Nabateans (under Nebaioth) suffer very much from the brevity with which they are treated. The history of the name and divisions of Palestine ought certainly to have been more detailed. In a Lexicon that covers Greek and Roman times we should have been told something more about the meaning of Syria. A graver fault is the absence of any articles on Coelesyria, and Arabia. The shifting of the names Bashan, Batanæa, El-Betheniyeh during the period covered by the book, is unnoticed. Something should have been said of the different uses, even within the Old Testament of the term Bashan. Perhaps the Belka and the Ghor have been omitted as terms arising after "the victory of Islam," but they ought to have been separately referred to if only for the purposes of comparison. Among other omissions are these. Under Beth-Dagon there should have been a cross reference to Dok, and under Dathema the Syriac variant reading of 1 Macc. v. 9, Rametha should have been quoted in connection with the reference to Remthel. The other possible meanings of Kiriath Sepher should have been given. The extension of Galilee round the east coast of the Lake is too important for the understanding of many passages in Josephus to have been omitted. Other Geliloth of the Old Testament should have been given than those mentioned on pp. 60 and 63. Admedera was a Nabatean station, the most northerly known, as well as a Roman. The article on the Shephelah is not only defective but erroneous. To say that it is only two or three (German ?) miles broad is to exclude the most im-

portant part of it; to say that the Philistines reached these well-known seats *before* Israel arrived in the country is to go against all recent evidence. Were these and other defects supplied, and such recent works drawn on as W. Max Müller's *Asien u. Europa nach den altägypt. Denkm.*, and the Nabatean inscriptions in the *Corpus Inscr. Semitic.* consulted—the value of Pastor von Starck's work, which is already considerable, would be immensely enhanced.

Die Sozialhygiene der Juden und des Altorientalischen Völkerkreises, by Dr. Alfred Nossig,¹ is a reprint of one hundred and fifty pages from an *Introduction to the Study of Social Hygiene*. After slight sketches of ancient laws affecting public health among the Chinese, Hindus, Persians and Egyptians, Dr. Nossig goes into more detail on the social hygiene of the Mosaic laws. From a scientific standpoint he emphasises as fundamental the intimate union which the law-books of the Pentateuch enforce between ethics and public health; and then he treats of the laws to prevent infection, to regulate foods, personal cleanliness and the intercourse of the sexes. Then he discusses the sources of the Mosaic legislation on public health. The treatment of the subject does not strike one as thorough. On the last point, for instance, Dr. Nossig makes no use of the results of the literary criticism of the Old Testament beyond a quotation from Renan that the Pentateuch was edited after the exile. But it is of interest to learn that he is of opinion that all the laws of Moses, which have to do with social hygiene, are more akin to Egyptian than to any other Asiatic customs. On the explanation of the laws themselves, Dr. Nossig has many interesting statements to make. His treatment of them is an almost unbroken panegyric of the wisdom, moral and physical, of the legislators of Israel. More important are some quotations to this effect which he makes from French medical authorities, especially Dr. Guéneau de Mussy, *Etude sur l'hygiène de Moïse et des anciens Israélites* (Paris, 1885), and Dr. Leven, *L'Hygiène des Israélites*, (Versailles, 1884). "Moses," says the latter, "was the first who perfectly understood the nature of man. His hygiene is astonishingly adapted to the nature of the human organism. According to him health depends not only on the influences of the outer world, but still more upon moral hygiene." And De Mussy says: "One only needs to read

¹ *Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, Stuttgart, Leipzig, etc., 1894.*

the word "unclean" (which for centuries has been used in a moral meaning) in its medico-hygienic sense, to believe that in the Bible one is reading a thoroughly modern system of sanitary regulations." "By the infinite precautions which it orders to be taken (says Bertin-Sans in the *Dictionnaire encycl. des sciences médicales*) and by the ceremonies which it institutes as the guarantee of their execution, the fight against contagion assumes the proportions of a real sanitary system." Sometimes Dr. Nossig goes too far. His attempts to show that Moses was acquainted with the germ-origin of disease are not successful. His treatment of the "Leprosy" which is described as breaking out on walls and houses does not convince the reader. He asserts that the green and red spots which Leviticus xiv. 33-45 describes as appearing on houses, may be "germs of typhus, croup, etc." But of these spots we really know nothing. The alleged passage of leprosy from the human body to material objects has never been proved. Again, on the moral results of circumcision, Dr. Nossig surely exaggerates, (p. 52): it is the first time one has heard of Jewish men as distinguished above others for their purity. His defence, too, of the Mosaic marriage laws is curious. He first defends the provision for very early marriage as healthy and favourable to morals, and then praises the provision for easy and frequent divorce as necessary because marriages were made at a time of life when they could not be founded on the higher affections or on lasting friendship and esteem. "Had Moses, like the Roman Church, declared marriage to be insoluble, he would have thereby inflicted on this institution a most serious blow and shattered his own work. But what he demands is only a *true* marriage, not an *eternal* one." To this question there are other sides, which Dr. Nossig ignores. But his remarks on the whole relation of the sexes in Israel are very suggestive. The last eighty pages are occupied with a sketch of the Talmudic and Rabbinic laws on public health, in which Dr. Nossig traces a gradual improvement of medical knowledge, and praises the Rabbis at the expense even of the famous Greek physicians. He has four chapters on Maimonides as the "Renewer of Jewish Social Hygiene." The closing chapters deal with the modern results of Jewish sanitation. From Tacitus, who distinguishes the Jews for their health ("corpora hominum salubria et ferentia laborum"), and notices that they escape the epidemics to which

the armies of Pompey succumbed—to the present day the Jews have excited both the admiration and the suspicion of Gentiles by their extraordinary freedom from epidemics. This, says Dr. Nossig, is no riddle, but due to their “strenuous and detailed regulations for nourishment and disinfection.” And he quotes many authorities in support of this. Perhaps he does not give sufficient weight to the fact that the present race of Jews are descended from ancestors who proved their exceptional strength by survival through conditions of life extraordinarily severe. The frequent migrations, the social persecutions, the confinement to the most unsanitary parts of cities, must have killed out those families of inferior health which among Christians have been permitted to survive and reproduce themselves. On the other hand, Dr. Nossig points out the drawback from which the modern Jew suffers in his withdrawal from all forms of agricultural labour. Both Moses and the Rabbis insisted on physical work as indispensable to health. Lastly, Dr. Nossig’s tract may be recommended for its large list of medical and political authorities on the subject. Theological readers have no other means of knowing these. In the appendix is an interesting defence of the Jewish method of slaughtering animals.

Students will be glad to know that Professor Strack, of Berlin, has issued a new and partly improved edition of his *Einleitung in den Thalmud*.¹ It is a most admirable work. A new edition of Wuensche’s translation of the Babylonian Talmud, with notes, has been begun. It will be completed in twenty-eight parts.²

A second issue, in parts, has been begun of Kautzsch’s German translation of the Old Testament.³ It is to be completed by October.

The second edition of Prof. Robertson Smith’s *Old Testament in the Jewish Church* has been translated into German by Prof. Rothlein under the title *Das A. T., seine Entstehung u. Ueberlieferung, Grundzüge der a. t. Kritik in populär-wissenschaftlichen Vorlesungen*.⁴

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

¹ Leipzig: Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1894.

² Berlin: Felber.

³ Freiburg i. B. u. Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr.

⁴ *ibid.*

*PHYSICAL AND HISTORICAL PROBABILITIES
RESPECTING THE AUTHORSHIP AND AU-
THORITY OF THE MOSAIC BOOKS.*

VI. THE EXODUS.

THE book of Exodus, as we have seen, is the main stem of the Pentateuch, that to which its roots in Genesis converge, and that which supports its branches, foliage and fruit in Numbers, Leviticus and Deuteronomy. Everything in Genesis has its end and object in the emigration from Egypt, and the Exodus itself is that which sustains the historical fabric of the law and the conquest. The whole thus constitutes one grand symmetrical literary structure, linked with contemporary historical facts, and constituting the basis of Christianity itself. This great event may therefore form a suitable termination to the present series of papers.

Modern discoveries have enabled us to place the Exodus more satisfactorily than heretofore in connection with contemporary Egyptian and Palestinian history, and to appreciate every step of the march of Israel in search of liberty. Formerly this was difficult, in consequence of the unsettled state of Egyptian chronology and want of topographical information, while our Biblical historian is careless even of the personality of the rulers of Egypt. To the writer of Genesis and Exodus they are collectively merely Pharaoh, just as we now speak of the Czar, the Sultan or the Khedive, with scarcely a thought of the individual name of the potentate in question. The historian of the Exodus is fortunately more particular as to topography, and the

careful surveys of modern times have enabled us to follow his footsteps in a manner impossible at any previous period between the Exodus itself and the present day. The inscriptions and other records of the Pharaohs of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties are also coming forward in a remarkable manner in aid of the comparative chronology.

We may select a few facts bearing on questions of place and date, in evidence of the contention that the writer of the book of Exodus is a contemporary of the events he describes, and that his chronology and topography are confirmed by modern investigation. Miracles indeed now thicken upon us as compared with the narratives in Genesis; and this to some minds gives a mythical air to the narrative with which they are associated, simple and natural though it is in itself. It is, however, in the great critical periods of nations and of the world that such deviations from ordinary uniformity become most necessary and reasonable; but in Exodus they are wonders of the true Mosaic type, mostly beneficent in object, effected by natural means, and described in a manner to show accurate observation of facts.

Naville's discovery of the site of Pithom in the eastern part of the Wady Tumilat leading from the Nile to the ancient head of the Red Sea, and the farther identification of Gesen and the City Rameses at the western end of the same valley, have fixed the point of departure of the Israelites and the earlier stages of their journey. The fact ascertained by its structure and inscriptions, that Pithom was a store or arsenal city built by the great Egyptian king Rameses II. has established the time of the oppression. The evidence that Pithom and Heroopolis were one and the same, and that this city was near the northern end of the Red Sea, then extending all the way to Lake Timsah, removes a number of geographical doubts, so that we may

now proceed with some confidence in our enquiry as to the facts, whether physical or historical.

A preliminary question is that of the time of the sojourn of Israel in Egypt, and I am glad to see that attention has been directed to this point in *THE EXPOSITOR* of December, 1893.¹ Those who have read that article will easily comprehend the following facts.

To a cursory reader of Genesis and Exodus in the English versions, the period of the sojourn in Egypt seems to have been 400 or 430 years. In Genesis xv. the prediction to Abraham runs thus: "And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs and shall serve them, and they shall afflict them; four hundred years." Here it does not at first appear to the reader that the period of 400 years covers not merely the affliction but the whole sojourn, though this is evidently the intention. In Exodus xii. 40 and 41 the termination of the period is given with great precision as follows: "Now the sojourn of the children of Israel who dwelt in Egypt² was four hundred and thirty years. And it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the selfsame day it came to pass that all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt." Here again the sojourning is that in Canaan as well as in Egypt. This we learn in three ways: (1) the genealogical lists in the same book show that the residence of the Israelites in Egypt from the time of the immigration of Jacob extended only about 216 years; (2) the Septuagint translation, to remove what seemed an ambiguity, or perhaps because their manuscripts were different from ours, add the words "and in the land of Canaan"; and this is just the sort of question on which we should specially value the authority of the Sep-

¹ *The Sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt*, by the Right Rev. the Bishop of Bath and Wells.

² R.V. changes this for the worse.

tuagint; (3) the Samaritan Pentateuch agrees with the Septuagint; (4) Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians states the whole period from the covenant with Abraham to the giving of the law at 430 years. We are thus enabled to conclude that the date so minutely given, even to a day, in Exodus xii. may be reckoned from the entry of Abraham into Canaan, and that the period of 430 years covers the whole of the sojourning which was to be the lot of his posterity till their return to Canaan as a conquering nation. This enables us also to see in this chronology the hand of Moses. It was not his mission to regard the Israelites as merely the descendants of an immigrant Syrian chief who had come into Egypt about two centuries previously, but to direct his people to the promise made to Abraham, and to have them regard the whole of the sojourning, whether in Canaan or in Egypt, as one episode in their history, to be terminated by their possessing the promised land. To Moses the oppression is merely the means of obliging Israel to fulfil its divinely ordained destiny, which it must fulfil whether Pharaoh and the Egyptians are friendly or hostile.

This wide grasp of the situation which many even of modern writers fail to take, befits the mind of the great Hebrew leader and the divine impulse that animated him. Paul, actuated by the same spirit, takes the same view.¹

Some important historical conclusions hang on this question. Those who regard the 430 years as the time of the residence in Egypt are obliged to place the entry of Joseph into that country in the reign of one of the foreign invaders known as the Hyksos or Shepherd kings, before the eighteenth Egyptian Dynasty, thereby raising a host of difficulties, such as the unlikelihood of the land of Goshen being open to occupation by the Israelites, the incongruity of a

¹ For an excellent summary of the evidence in favour of the shorter chronology, I may refer to Dr. Kellog's Lectures on "Abraham, Moses and Joseph," New York, 1887.

hatred of shepherds on the part of the invaders, who were themselves shepherds, the thoroughly native surroundings of Joseph in the history, and the impossibility of the Israelites having escaped being involved in the fierce and destructive warfare between the native Egyptians and the Hyksos, ending in the expulsion of the latter. On the other hand, the shorter date, say of 215 to 218 years, brings the deportation of Joseph into the later part of the reign of Thothmes III., the greatest king of the eighteenth Dynasty, which succeeded the Hyksos, a king whose character and relations with Syria and its tribes fit in thoroughly with the Mosaic narrative, as do the subsequent events of Egyptian history up to the Exodus. We cannot look on the benevolent yet sagacious countenance of Thothmes, as represented on his statues, without feeling that he was a man likely to patronize Joseph, and we know that his immediate successors, the Amenhoteps, were friendly to Semitic peoples. Were it possible to devote one of these articles to the life of Joseph, all these points could be fully illustrated with great benefit to our comprehension of the history of the great Hebrew minister, which has been disjointed in its historical aspect by the leaning of Egyptologists to the longer date.

It is noteworthy here that on the correct chronology the two fine obelisks from On or Heliopolis, now in London and New York, must have been set up in the time of Joseph, and by his patron, Thothmes III., whose inscription occupies the central and original lines on the four faces. The lateral lines were added by Rameses II., the oppressor of the Israelites, who "knew not Joseph." Thus these obelisks, so strangely transferred to the chief cities of the two sides of the Atlantic, are monuments of two epochs when Hebrew and Egyptian history came closely into contact.

One other little point is too tempting to be passed by. In the twenty-third and following years of his reign Thothmes

III. invaded Palestine, defeating its allied kings at Megiddo, and reducing them to the condition of tributaries. He inscribed a list of the tributary tribes on the temple of Karnak, where it still exists, and has been copied and compared with the Semitic names of places and tribes in Palestine.¹ Among the names are two which have been read "Jacob El," and "Joseph El," the first near Hebron, the second farther north,—the addition of the name of God (El) to the names being supposed to indicate a special religious aspect, or to be similar to what we see in such names as Israel and Ishmael. This is inexplicable to those who hold to the long period, because on that theory the migration of Jacob to Egypt must have occurred about two centuries before the campaign of Thothmes, and such names could, in that case, be only survivals from an earlier date, a very unlikely supposition in the circumstances. According to the correct chronology, all fits into place. Jacob must have settled in Egypt about the fortieth year of Thothmes III. In the twenty-third year of Thothmes he was still in Canaan. Further, we learn from Genesis that he had divided his tribe and his flocks into two bands, one at Hebron, the other as far north as Dothan; and Genesis also intimates that he had already promoted Joseph, though then a mere boy, over his brothers;² so that one of the divisions might be known as that of Jacob, the other as that of Joseph. We may even suppose that the brothers in charge of the Shechem or Dothan flocks may have purposely named them as Joseph's, that he, if he were to be promoted over them, might share in the ignominy of subjection to Egypt and in the loss of the tribute payment. In any case we can readily understand the officers of Thothmes registering the two divisions of the tribe of Jacob, or Israel, in this

¹ See Maspero and Tomkins, *Transactions of Society of Biblical Archaeology*, and *Transactions Victoria Institute*.

² The "coat of many colours" is a proof of this.

way.¹ Further, when Jacob afterwards went to Egypt, he could be represented as already a vassal of the Pharaoh, and merely changing his habitation from one part of his dominions to another. Had Jacob known of those lists of Thothmes which remain to our own time, he could have referred to this relation. At the same time, the recent expulsion of the Hyksos must have left much land in Lower Egypt open to occupation by the Israelites. Thus, what in one view of the chronology is an insoluble enigma becomes a remarkable coincidence. All this must have been well known to Moses and his contemporaries, but was not likely to be known to Israelites in later times. It would seem indeed as if even such native authorities as Manetho were mistaken as to these matters. The inscriptions of Thothmes remain, however, to tell their tale.

In like manner our shorter chronology brings the advent of the king who knew not Joseph to the time of Horus or Seti I., the earliest kings of the 19th Dynasty, who are known to have been hostile to the Semitic proclivities of the later kings of the preceding Dynasty. It brings the height of the oppression into its proper place in the long reign of Rameses II., and the Exodus into one of the short reigns which succeeded; while, as we shall see, it makes the Exodus itself one factor in the obscure ending of the great nineteenth Dynasty, and its replacement by the twentieth.

It has been objected to the shorter chronology that it does not give time for the multiplication of the Israelites to the millions of the Exodus. But we are not to limit the tribe of Jacob to the threescore and ten souls of his family. If Abraham could muster three hundred and eighteen fighting men "born in his own house," the tribe of Jacob could scarcely have been less numerous, and, besides, we are told

¹ At the time of the Exodus, also, the northern site was assigned to the posterity of Joseph as properly theirs.

that the increase of the Israelites in Egypt was exceptional (like that of some communities in Western America in recent times), and many foreigners must have attached themselves to them in the time of their prosperity.

It was at one time supposed that Egyptian history gave no account of the Exodus, and Manetho would seem to have confused this event with the expulsion of the Hyksos; but the certain identification of the Pharaoh of the oppression with Rameses II., and of the Pharaoh of the Exodus with the last of the nineteenth Dynasty, removes this defect. A later king, Rameses III., belonging to the twentieth Dynasty, has left us an autobiographical sketch, now known as the great Harris Papyrus, and in the introduction to this he narrates the causes which brought Setnekt, his father, to the throne as the founder of a new dynasty. This introduction has been translated by Eisenlohr, Brugsch, Birch, and Chabas.¹ The translations differ somewhat in their details, but are summed up by Birch in the following statement:²—"The interval between Siptah, the last king of the 19th dynasty, and Setnekt (the first king of the 20th) was one of much disturbance. From the great Harris Papyrus it appears that a great exodus took place from Egypt. In consequence of the troubles for many years it says there was no master." It also makes mention of one Arisu or Areos, a Syrian, as a leader in these disturbances. In other words, within about twenty years of the close of the long and pretentious, if not glorious, reign of Rameses II., the nineteenth Dynasty came to an end in disaster and anarchy, out of which arose a new dynasty. As to the details of this revolution there are no doubt some differences of opinion; but I think the majority of Egyptologists will accept the following general statements. Rameses II. died after a reign of sixty-seven years. He was succeeded by one

¹ *Trans. Soc. Bib. Archaeology*, vol. i. *Records of the Past*, vol. viii.

² *History of Egypt*, p. 186.

of his sons, Meneptah, who was somewhat aged before his accession, and seems to have reigned only eight years. The principal event of his reign is an incursion of Lybians and others from the West, which was repelled; but his annals contain no mention of any rebellion of slaves in Egypt. He seems to have died peacefully, and to have been buried with his fathers. Nevertheless, he has been often regarded as the Pharaoh of the Exodus; but this probably arises from confounding him with one of his successors who has the same or a very similar name. He was succeeded by his son, Seti II., or Seti Meneptah. His reign also was short, probably only four years, and he seems either to have been slain in civil strife or to have had to flee to Ethiopia, a usurper, Amenmes, of whom little is known, apparently taking his place. He was replaced by the legitimate line in the persons of Siptah or Siptah Meneptah¹ and his queen Ta-user. After reigning seven years, Siptah disappears mysteriously, leaving an unoccupied tomb, afterwards plastered over and occupied by his successor, and apparently no heir who could succeed him, as his queen Ta-user is reckoned by Manetho as the last sovereign of the Dynasty. At this time occurred the great Exodus and the anarchy referred to in the Harris Papyrus. Whether the Arisu of the papyrus represents the leader of the Exodus or an invader who took advantage of the anarchy, is not yet certainly known. In any case, out of the anarchy arose Setnekt, or Set the victorious, the founder of the twentieth Dynasty. Rameses III., an able and successful ruler, was his son; and it was in his reign that the Harris Papyrus was written. That Siptah was the Pharaoh of the Exodus is rendered probable by his sudden disappearance while still a young man or in the prime of life, by his unoccupied tomb, by the attempted regency of his queen, and by the anarchy which followed. I may add that Siptah, as photo-

¹ Possibly a brother of Seti II.

graphed by Petrie from a bas-relief on his tomb, shows the fine features of Rameses II., his grandfather, but cast in a weaker mould. He may have been as proud as Rameses II., but without his force of character, and is altogether such a person as we should expect in the haughty, petulant, yet vacillating ruler with whom Moses negotiated, and whose weak character was hardened by God to his destruction.

On the above view the comparative chronology of the life of Moses will stand thus :—

Birth of Moses :	38th year of Rameses II.						
Flight of Moses to Midian :	78th year of Rameses II.						
Moses in Midian, 41 or 42 years, or, allowing for overlaps and preliminaries of Exodus, 40 years.	<table> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="5">}</td> <td>18 last years of Rameses II.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8 years of Meneptah.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 or 4 of Seti II.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5 of Amenmes.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7 of Siptah.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	}	18 last years of Rameses II.	8 years of Meneptah.	3 or 4 of Seti II.	5 of Amenmes.	7 of Siptah.
}	18 last years of Rameses II.						
	8 years of Meneptah.						
	3 or 4 of Seti II.						
	5 of Amenmes.						
	7 of Siptah.						
Moses returns, Exodus :	Last year of Siptah.						
Israel in the Wilderness : 40 years.	<table> <tbody> <tr> <td>Anarchy and Setnekt.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>30 years.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rameses III., 10 years.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Anarchy and Setnekt.	30 years.	Rameses III., 10 years.			
Anarchy and Setnekt.							
30 years.							
Rameses III., 10 years.							
Israel enters Canaan 10th year of Rameses III., and only one or two years after his successful raid into Palestine, in which he weakened the Hittites and other tribes preparatory to the conquest by Joshua. ¹							

This remarkable parallelism of events, rendered in the highest degree probable by the most recent discoveries, strengthens the conviction that in the early chapters of Exodus we are dealing with contemporary annals, and with the autobiography of the great law-giver.

Let us now glance at the topography of the earlier part of the Exodus, that we may note the geography as well as the chronology of our author. The traveller who journeys by the railway from Cairo to Ismailia, taking with him a

¹ He was perhaps the "Hornet" referred to in Exodus xxiii., Deut. vii., and Joshua xxiv. ; for the hornet or wasp was the emblem of Lower Egypt.

good map of the district, can appreciate at a glance the character and position of the land of Goshen and the facilities for exit to the East by the Wady Tumilat. This strip of fertile land, stretching across the desert, was originally the channel of a branch of the Nile flowing eastward into the Red Sea, which then extended, along the depression of the old Bitter Lakes, nearly or quite to Lake Timsah. Even before the time of Moses, the gradual silting up of the sea and the slight changes of level which this region has undergone had rendered it necessary to improve the outlet by artificial canalisation, a process continued and extended at intervals down to the present time, when the Sweetwater Canal irrigates the valley and carries the Nile water as far as Suez. This beautiful valley and a tract at its western end, rich in corn lands, pasturage and date palms, constituted the districts of Rameses or Goshen on the West and of Thukot or Succoth on the East. Of the former the capital was Rameses, of the latter Pithom. Both were fortified towns, built by Rameses II. with the forced labour of the Hebrews and of foreign captives, in order to form arsenals for his armies on their march to his eastern expeditions, and to keep in check the discontented Israelitish population.

If now we read the twelfth to the fifteenth chapters of Exodus with this topography before us, we find ourselves in presence of the following stages of the Exodus:—

(1) The Israelites, gathering at and near Rameses, where a large body of them was probably ordinarily stationed. The Egyptian Court may at the time have been in Rameses itself or at Bubastis, or even at Zoan on the north.

(2) Negotiations going on between the Israelites, through Moses and Aaron, and the Pharaoh, respecting the desired permission to go into the desert to sacrifice. In these negotiations neither party was desirous to push matters to extremity; because if the Israelites were to move without

locality ; but after reading his latest exposition of his views in his address to the Victoria Institute (1893), I am inclined to adhere to my original opinion.¹ The difference however amounts to only a few miles in the place of crossing, and leaves the main facts unchanged ; though Naville's view implies bad generalship on the part of Moses, or that Pharaoh came upon his flank earlier than one would infer from the Biblical narrative or than was probable in the circumstances.

These points being premised, we may now ask the question how they agree with our supposition that the history is the testimony of a witness of the events, acquainted with the nature of the country and aware of all the conditions, Divine and human, under which the movement was to be effected.

That the people should not proceed by the short northern route "the way of the Philistines" was an obvious dictate of prudence. It passed near important fortified towns, and would lead to a direct and immediate conflict with a powerful military nation. On the other hand, the route by the Wady Tumilat was in the first instance through a practicable and well-watered country, inhabited by a friendly population, and with no fortified place other than Pithom. All went well accordingly with the fugitives, till they arrived at Etham² on the edge of the wilderness, and on the eastern boundary of Succoth. Here, if they pursued a straight course, they had before them a desert journey of several days in which Pharaoh was not likely to follow them, but at the end of which they might expect to meet hostile Canaanites. But why turn at this point and place the Red Sea between themselves and safety. The immediate reason is said to have been, not dread of the

¹ Reasons are stated in detail in *Modern Science in Bible Lands*.

² Etham has been supposed to be a defensive wall or fortress, but Naville is probably right in identifying it with a district at the edge of the desert, named *Atuma* by the Egyptians. The "edge" or border of the desert is at this place very well defined.

wilderness or of the hostile Canaanites, but to induce Pharaoh to follow to his own destruction. In other words, it was placing an army in a position of difficulty in order to provoke an attack. The objects to be gained, if successful, would be to incapacitate the Egyptians from farther pursuit, to gain prestige in the opinion of all the neighbouring nations, and to be in a position to lie over for a time in the peninsula of Sinai to organise before attempting the conquest of Palestine. Still it was a bold and dangerous movement, even admitting that the Red Sea was known on certain rare and exceptional occasions to be fordable near Pi-hahiroth. We can readily believe that this was Divine rather than human strategy, and that only a strong faith in the guidance of God could induce any leader to attempt it.

After exploring the country around Ismailia and toward the site of old Pithom, and south toward Suez, I placed myself one evening on the rising ground between Ismailia and the site of Pithom, near to where the Etham encampment probably was, and endeavoured to realize the thoughts and plans of the leader of Israel. He had already had some experience of the confusion and difficulty of the march of the host and the mixed multitude; and casting his eye anxiously westward may have seen crowds of stragglers, loiterers and new recruits struggling to reach the camp, and to find their appropriate places, and may have thought of the consequences of a charge of Egyptian chariots against the rear of such a body, encumbered with every kind of impedimenta and without regular organization. Looking east, he could see the long stretches of desert over which the way lay to the promised land, yellow and dreary, with few wells, and with predatory tribes to embarrass his movements. The moment was an anxious one, for next day must commit them to the dangers and privations of the desert journey, though it might free them from the risk of

immediate pursuit on the part of Pharaoh. The intimation of the Divine will that the host must move southward, may have been a relief in the circumstances, though how it would result was a matter of faith. Looking in this direction, the leader could see the whole region as far as the steep high ridge of Jebel Attaka forty miles distant. In the foreground the eastern end of the Wady spread out into a plain, partly watered and cultivated, but affording no protection to the flank of the marching multitude, should Pharaoh pursue and attack them. At the distance however of fifteen miles the conical mass of Jebel Shebremet jutting from the Geneffeh range closes in the plain to a narrow pass;¹ and, once there, a pursuing chariot force could strike only the rear of the host, and this in a narrow space which might be defended against it. So far the position of affairs was plain, all beyond was uncertain. We may be sure, however, that the camp was raised as early as possible in the morning, and that a push was made to occupy the Migdol or Shebremet pass in time to protect the people from any attack in the rear.

Egyptian scouts must have dogged the march, for the change of direction was no sooner made than it was known to Pharaoh, and his immediate resolve was to take advantage of the movement. So rapidly were his arrangements made, that his chariot force, forming the van of his army, and probably led by Siptah himself, made its appearance in the evening, while the wearied Israelites were preparing to pitch their tents by the side of the sea near Pi-hahiroth, and were possibly settling a rear-guard across the pass to protect them through the night. But the sight of the broad line of advancing chariots struck terror into the people, and apparently banished all thought of resistance. The despair, the reproach of Moses for bringing them into this strait, his

¹ I think Shebremet itself was the Migdol of the narrative; but there may have been a watch-tower or post on the mountain to protect the pass.

attempt to encourage them to stand fast, the crying of Moses to the Lord, and the final order to go forward into the sea, are all vividly pictured in Exodus xiv., as by the pen of an actor in the scene. But the Egyptians did not at once attack. The hour was late and the pass was narrow, and the cloudy pillar in rear had some terrors for them, though it failed to give courage to the Israelites. In the meantime, by a Divine arrangement in favour of the fugitives, one of those strong north-east winds, which at some seasons course along the Red Sea Valley, drove out the ebb-tide so as to leave a practicable passage across, just as in modern times, before the construction of the canal, a precarious crossing could sometimes be effected at low tide above Suez. Moses is directed to cause Israel to advance into the sea. It was no holiday procession. They were wearied with a day's march and in the midst of preparations to encamp. Beaten with the wind and drenched with the rain, they had to descend in darkness into the muddy sea-bottom, and painfully, and we may be sure with many fears, to make their way across. Dread of the pursuers no doubt lent speed to their movements, and it may have been a somewhat tumultuous and hurried flight. They crossed in safety, and as the morning dawned on them they must have experienced that great revulsion of feeling to which voice was given in the impromptu song of Moses and the chorus of Miriam and her companion maidens.

In the meantime the Egyptians, puzzled perhaps at first with the noise and commotion among the fugitives, discovered towards morning what had happened, and rushing forward in pursuit, plunged into the sea-bed, which they hoped might still give them time to cross. But they were engulfed in the swiftly returning waters.¹ So perished Siptah Meneptah, his best officers, and the finest chariot force in

¹ The extreme rise of spring tides at Suez is nine feet—an amount quite sufficient to produce a destructive “bore” in the circumstances referred to.

the world. Egypt was left without a king, without the flower of its army, and without its servile population, and became a prey to the anarchy and confusion incident to so sudden and unexpected a revolution. Jehovah had triumphed gloriously. Pharaoh's chariots and his host he had cast into the sea. His "chosen captains" were drowned in the Red Sea. We could not be certain from the history or the song that Pharaoh himself perished: perhaps the narrator himself did not certainly know this; but the empty and usurped tomb in the valley of the kings at Thebes now tells the story.

We may not trace further the march to Sinai. This has been admirably done in the report of the Ordnance Survey with its beautiful maps and photographs, and has been well followed up by the late Mr. E. H. Palmer, in his work the *Desert of the Exodus*, in which he ably sums up the conclusions of the Survey as proving for all time that the narrative of the Exodus must have been written by an observant and highly intelligent contemporary.

We have now reached the point where Moses becomes his own biographer; and here every sentence bears witness to his hand, his head and his heart, in such a manner that the most obtuse can scarcely fail to see the evidence of his authorship. It is true however now as of old that they who will not hear Moses and the prophets would not be persuaded if one should rise from the dead, even though the risen one should be Christ Himself.

It is to be observed that this and the preceding articles are intended merely as specimens of a line of argument furnished by physical and historical facts which are daily growing in cogency, and of which we have had space to notice only a very few. In one respect it was familiar to many of the older divines in "uncritical" days; but the discoveries of our time have strengthened it in ways which

they could not anticipate, and which now enable us with scientific certainty to assign dates to documents heretofore subjected to doubt, and to place ourselves more distinctly on the standpoints of their writers. Should life and strength permit, and should there be demand, nothing could give greater pleasure to the writer than to treat other portions of early Bible history in a similar manner, or to answer questions as to points unavoidably passed over. In the meantime he places these papers before Bible students in the hope that they may at least prove suggestive, and may thus not be without utility in present circumstances.

J. WILLIAM DAWSON.

THE SECRET OF JESUS.

It would be difficult to name men of finer, gentler natures than Renan and Matthew Arnold, and it is deeply interesting to observe how they are affected by Christ. For Renan Christ was an incarnation of infinite kindness, irresistibly lovable, and known always the better the longer He was loved. Renan's expressions of love for Christ became more fervent with every decade of his life, and it is hardly a metaphor to say that at last he died on his knees, invoking Christ by the name of God. And yet, in relation to the mightier teachings of the Jesus of the Gospels, and the mightier wonders of Christianity as a phenomenon of world-history, what is the Christ of Renan after all but a beautiful phantom, exhaled from the fountains and the blue mists of the Palestine hills in Spring? And there was a tenuity in the manhood of Matthew Arnold, noble and fine as his genius was, that incapacitated him too for seeing more than a very little way into the secret and the system of Christ. "Sweetness and light." A pretty phrase. An

exquisite bit of rhetorical sugar-candy. Small account will that give of the stable and tremendous elements in the religion and in the morality of Jesus.

It is true, however, that Christ has a secret,—a fundamental principle, a keynote, a determining method in all His teaching. He stands unique in world-history for the extent to which he trusts the spiritual forces. Spirit is His *mot d'enigme*; His clue to the unity of the creation, in heaven and in earth. “God is a Spirit”; the good Spirit, the eternal Spirit; and all progress towards perfection, all joy worth enjoying, all life worth living, on the part of man, results from and consists in doing the will of God upon earth as it is done in heaven. As Christian children used to be taught by persons whom enlightened editors have now left far behind as fanatical enthusiasts, “man’s chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him for ever.” Christ and all the New Testament voices are at one in declaring the joy of man, temporal and eternal, to be God’s will, and the promotion of joy among men to be, in a superlative sense, the service and worship of God. The specialty of Christ lay in this, that He claimed to have a closer connection with the Spirit of the universe in declaring His will to mankind, and offering to mankind salvation in His name, than any other teacher, lawgiver, or sage who has offered counsel and guidance to mankind. Virtue, in His view, consisted essentially in the working out by man, in obedience to God and to His honour and glory, of the will of God in human salvation. Salvation was of the body as well as of the soul; but He did not promise to save the body first and the soul next, or to save the soul for the sake of the body, but to save the body through the soul, and in a unity with the soul. And the precepts and rules of this saving virtue were not left as a vague illumination diffused throughout the social atmosphere. They were gathered into the Christian law of love, taught and enforced by

Christ, the Son of God and the Son of man. He made a unique claim to speak in the name of God; and the object of His life and death, and of the mission He committed to His followers, was to fill the whole earth with a kingdom or commonwealth of righteousness and peace, of well-being and consecrated brotherhood, ruled by Divine Humanity represented by Himself.

The secret of Jesus then is spiritual and Divine. His method of operation is always the same, always from within and from above; beginning with the spirit and the life, and acting upon the body and the environment through the spirit and the life. "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." Had these words been always applied, with intelligence and with candour, to the interpretation of the words of Christ, what masses of superstition, clouding the minds of nations and generations, what deluges of cant and imbecility, might have been escaped!

It was said just now that Christ stands unique in world-history as relying upon spiritual forces. No one has understood what the spiritual forces are, or how they act, so well as He. No one, in fact, has here come within measurable distance of Him. It is not too much to say that the most wonderful thing in the literature of the world is His prediction of the influence of spiritual forces as exemplified in the results of His own death. "I," He said, "if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me."

Those words are in the New Testament. If Christ did not utter them, then some other man uttered them respecting Him, and we shall have two problems to solve—both of them becoming by the doubling insoluble—instead of one certainly marvellous but indubitable fact to deal with. If He did utter them, it is placed scientifically beyond doubt that a homeless field preacher in Judæa, at the time when

the Roman Empire filled the world, foretold that spiritual forces represented by His death, as the sequel of His life, would "draw all men to Him," that is to say, make Him the central object of observation to mankind, the teacher and spiritual ruler of the human race.

What do we behold, now that nearly two thousand years have passed since Christ hung, a dying form, upon the cross? The Roman Empire has crumbled into dust. The civilization of the world has been born again. The leadership of mankind is in the hands of the Christian nations. And the progress that has been made is indisputably due to the conceptions of man, his duties and his relations, that have emanated from Christ, and were symbolized by His death and His life. Christian ethics have become the ethics of all philosophical schools. Christian moralists have pronounced against slavery, and it is fast disappearing from the face of the earth. Already the Christian missionary has become a voice of justice and of mercy, pleading in every land for the afflicted and oppressed in the name of Christ.

He made Himself the main subject of His prophecy. "If I be lifted up." This would have been blasphemous presumption or maniacal folly in any one but Christ. The farther, however, we travel, by the count of centuries, from Him, the more clearly do we discern the altitude in which He towers over His own contemporaries and over each succeeding age. While the spiritual forces brought into the world's atmosphere by His death have been at work in historical evolution, civilization has passed through many phases of cyclic change. There was, to begin with, New Testament Christianity—the Christianity which expressed the inspiration of men who, as Renan says, were filled with Jesus. It is embodied in the New Testament, and all the languages in the world could not afford words strong enough to express the resultant value of that book. But this first Christianity was succeeded by a Christianity curi-

ously contrasted with that of the men who companied with Christ and His apostles. The Christianity of the early Fathers and commentators was, as has frequently been exemplified in the history of the world, a relapse into conditions of moral and intellectual feebleness. It was a singularly childish creed. It materialized the imagery which Christ had framed to express His own unique personality and His pervasively spiritual method, into a literalism almost incredibly babyish. Tennyson has treated of this faith, with its cups of Glastonbury and shrines in which "you scarce could see the Christ for saints," in a spirit of mild sympathy not untinged by kindly contempt. Innocent but not innocuous persons, whose artless logic reminds one of that of the figures set up in the Platonic dialogues to be bowled over by the arguments of Socrates, call themselves Christian Socialists, and bombard Smith and Mill on the strength of this Christianity. But it passed away, like dew from the grass, in the brightening day of Christian civilization. It was succeeded by the Christianity of the Latin Church. Far as this form of Christianity fell short of the New Testament ideal, it was memorably strong. It did great things for Europe. It wrestled with the flaming portent of Islamism, and rescued modern civilization from its scorching embrace. But it settled into the Papacy, and the Papacy could not be accepted as the fulfilment of the promises of Christ. Meanwhile Greek Christianity ran through phases of its own, and it will hardly be denied that its Divine fire gradually flagged, its missionary zeal abated, its power of realizing the kingdom of Divine humanity declined. But the full-grown mind of Europe in the sixteenth century, recurring to the New Testament and the Hebrew Bible, broke indignantly away from Pope, Patriarch, and patristic infantility alike, and reconstituted Christianity on the model provided by the men steeped in the inspiration of Christ.

The progress of civilized mankind since this last great branching of the Christian tree has been greater than was effected in all the previous centuries since the fall of the Roman Empire. And science has to give account of the fact that all the best elements in the civilization of to-day are by common consent associated with, or expressly derived from, the crucified field preacher who said that He would draw all men unto Him.

Will it be alleged that the words on which all this depends were a prophecy of the resurrection, and merely implied Christ's belief that, if the expected miracle took place, the rest would follow? The reply is that, whether the words were prophetic of the resurrection or were not, Christ could not possibly have meant that the resurrection, *viewed as a sign or wonder*, would perforce draw all men to Him. He had expressly, by way of example, specified this very miracle as powerless, in itself, to make men believe in Him. "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded if one rose from the dead." Christ lent no countenance to the crude error that miracles constitute an irresistible logic, compelling men to believe.

When we look with some carefulness we find that, in their own way, all the greatest thinkers and the greatest benefactors of mankind have taken essentially the same view as Christ on the primary importance of the spiritual forces. Aristotle notably placed the life before the organism, and on this point there was no discrepancy between him and Plato. But neither Plato nor Aristotle took upon him to *command* men, in God's name, to be spiritually whole and healthfully happy. Towards this, indeed, the reason of man, and the semi-articulate conscience of man, as represented by the philosophers of Greece, on the one hand, and the organizing and law-making genius of Rome, on the other, had tended. We may almost hear Plato and Socrates crying out for a God to command men to walk in

the way of righteousness and in the pleasantness of virtue. Aristotle, the cooler, perhaps the stronger head, restricts himself more severely to knowledge, and therefore more explicitly exhibits the impotence of mere knowledge to save the world. Christ said clearly and calmly that the God whom He commanded men to love without limit was such a God as He, Christ, revealed. He never faltered in this; He drew no line of demarcation between the divinity of His Father and His own. He also drew no line of demarcation between His manhood and that of His brethren, except in that He called Himself the only begotten Son of God, and challenged any one to convict Him of sin. There is no trace of evidence that the challenge was ever accepted. Declaring Himself to be sinless, He described His hearers as "evil." But He did not apply this term to their natural and instinctive habitudes as men, for He frankly referred to human affection, exhibited by parents to children, as a touchstone of the feeling which they might count upon it that God would entertain towards His human offspring. His divinity, His immortality, were shared by Christ with the lowliest of His followers. There was no Godhead in heaven more Divine than His; there was no Godhead on earth more Divine than that of the disciple who laid his head upon His breast. Man as man rises or falls with Christ.

He raised civilization from the dead. The Roman peace was for the nations a sleep unto death. "Christianity" and "Europe" are used by Novalis as equivalent terms. The question of all questions for the world at this hour is whether He can still breathe life into civilization, whether Christian peace, bloodless yet not oppressed with *ennui*, can fill the globe. If He saves civilisation, it will be in His own way, on His own non-compulsory method. The age may reject Him if it will. If the decision of modern society—of men of light and leading in philosophy, science,

literature, politics—is, “We will not have this Man to reign over us,” then no miraculous blast of fire will burst open society’s door to admit Him. And if the Labour party, speaking by their darling orators, turn from Christ; if, like Mr. Burns, they brand as bigotry the desire of any working man to retire from class demonstrations on the day consecrated to Christian rest; if they take no better lesson from the Church than that intolerance by which she so long belied her Master, and must cast out from their godless synagogue every fellow-workman who dares to be a Christian; then they will not derive much advantage from vapid flourishes about Jesus of Nazareth.

Men, however, who live so closely in contact with nature and fact as do the great body of the labouring men of Great Britain, may probably turn out to be more sagacious judges of Christ’s secret than some of the demagogues who volunteer to lead them. They may be trusted, even when the sugared lead of poisonous flattery is under their tongue, to have an instinctive feeling that temptation would never tempt if it were not pleasant at the moment. They know at heart that, though the four hundred false prophets may be making a tremendous hubbub, and may be entirely unanimous in telling their sovereign dupes that they will put all other classes under their feet, yet the one true prophet who disdains to lie may prove their best friend. They have heard of David Hume, and probably recognise in him a shrewd and unimpassioned judge of life. “Mankind,” said Hume, “are in all ages caught by the same baits.” There is always to be some grand transformation scene, some Paradise produced off-hand by a Government extemporized for the occasion, some Medea’s bath, some Merlin’s charm, or, as Carlyle said, some Morrison’s pill, to cure all ills and make everybody rich. Now Christ has no such secret as that. His method is inexorably opposed to that kind of thing. It was part of His secret—it is a

secret that has been penetrated by all the wise—that nothing can be done by generalities. Forests must be felled or planted tree by tree. Society consists of individuals, and you can no more build a society from the whole to the part than you can build a house by beginning in the air and building from the roof downward. You cannot regenerate a world by sprinkling. It takes baptism by water and perhaps by fire.

Christ's method has been verified, negatively and positively, times without number, but there is supreme difficulty in getting it practically accepted even in the London of to-day. The mechanical method—the method of sweeping generalization and of putting a face on things—is so plausible, so bewitchingly easy, that, even in solving the slums problem, it is noisily hailed and applauded, while the real solution is by means of this partial and external solution evaded and lost sight of. Of course, in Christ's method, the mechanical and the spiritual are combined and harmonized. It is a prominent note of that method that it abounds in positive commands, comprehends all things, and has few negations. "This ought ye to do, and not to leave the other undone." If the mechanical and material conditions are obviously, glaringly wrong, there is not a shadow of suggestion on the part of Christ that we are to pause in setting them right—in doing what is clearly wanted—with a view to letting the spiritual method be applied. When dwellings are unfit for human habitation, they are to be cleared away. If money is wanted for this, the voting of money may be the duty of the moment, to be instantly proceeded with. It may be a useful and philanthropic enterprise to build blocks of comfortable dwellings of a high order for respectable working-class tenants. Build them. But remember that all this leaves the essential difficulty of the slums problem untouched. All this may have resulted in driving the genuine slums population into worse dens

than they had previously occupied. Miss Octavia Hill, however, and other ladies both in London and in Edinburgh, and doubtless also in other towns, have effectually solved the slums problem, and shown the *sole* way in which it can be done. They apply to it Christ's method—the method of spirit and of life. They bring to bear upon the dilapidated and disabled humanity of the slums exactly that quickening breath of Divine life and spiritual influence which awakens it into appreciation of cleanliness, wholesomeness, order, decency, and all that goes to make four bare walls into a home. This is precisely Christ's way—the spiritual-force way. And it is verified by success.

The impotence of the other way—the mechanical way—when left to itself; the vanity of trusting the shell to make the organism instead of the living organism to make the shell; has also been abundantly verified by the scientific test of experience. The slum savage in France, ensconcing himself and his family in the spacious chamber of some mansion from which the Jacobin forerunners of our popular Gonzalos and Stephanos had expelled the owner, nestled down in the glorious emancipation of laziness, disorder, destructiveness, and filth, and was found in due time to have transmuted the place into a piggery.

If, however, the error had not been taking and plausible, it would not have imposed upon so many good-hearted people. That the environment makes the man, and not the man the environment, is a fallacy that flings wide the gates to devout sentimentalism and pious romance. It is so enlivening to think of Christ having gone away to build the new Jerusalem out of the rubies and pearls and diamonds of heaven, with celestial gold for pavement; and to look or the descent of this Jerusalem, Christian or Collectivist, to transform into its image the society of earth. It seems so commonplace, so trite, so disheartening, to say that, it Christ returned visibly to earth to-morrow, He could tell us

no better way of curing the ills that flesh and spirit are heir to than that of loving God beyond all measure, and loving our brethren as ourselves. This, however, is a fact. If any one can prove any other way to be better than this way, Christianity will be superannuated; at all events, there is not an iota of proof that Christ knew of a better way when he wept because Israel "would not" have the Divine Man to build their new Jerusalem for them. Ye must be born again, Christ said; born in the love of God and the love of man, renewed, each one of you, by the Spirit of God dwelling in you, forming Me, the Divine Bread, Me, the living Water, within you. He had no off-hand social New Jerusalem then. He has none now. He proposed then and He proposes now to transform the world by transforming individual men. He did certainly promise that, in some strictly scientific sense, some sense verifiable by experience, the new man in Christ, the man with Christ accepted into his heart and honestly made the model of his life, would be "a god, to change the whole world—earth, sea, skies, cities, governments." This may, at first glance, seem mystical. But it really is nothing more than the Christian form of the old doctrine that character makes the man, and man makes the world, or, to put it once more in Aristotle's form, that the life makes the organism, not the organism the life. Spurgeon was not a learned man, but strong in common sense, and Aristotle would have understood, and Jesus Christ would have appreciated and approved of Spurgeon's meaning when he said that, if Christ returned, he, Spurgeon, would just go on preaching as before. Spurgeon, it may be presumed, did not intend to say that his preaching was perfect, but only that he had no warrant to expect it to be reinforced by any such miracle as should compel men, would they or would they not, to accept Christ. That "the kingdom of God is coming down from heaven to earth," bran new, with accommoda-

tion benches for the poor when they change places with the rich, and a paternal Government, on the principles of Rousseau and the French Convention, to provision the planet, while "the toiling many," emancipated from labour, enjoy "the rights of man," is simply the last form of a very, very old fable. The beauty and plausibility of such fables, and not less the honest simplicity with which those who preach them sometimes believe in them, constitute, of course, the subtlest and most perilous element in their power. Nathaniels are often delightful people, but they are at their best where Christ, with characteristic sagacity, left their prototype—in the shade.

PETER BAYNE.

NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING ON THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST.

III. THE SYNOPTIST GOSPELS.

WE shall now consider the teaching of documents presenting a type of thought differing widely from that embodied in the Epistles of Paul.

The phrase "that day," already found in 2 Thessalonians i. 10, 2 Timothy i. 12, 18, iv. 8, occurs again in Matthew vii. 22, xxiv. 36, Mark xiii. 32, Luke x. 12, xvii. 31, xxi. 34, referring in each case to Christ's return to judge the world. Its use, without further specification, in this definite sense, reveals the definite place of the day of judgment in the thought of the early followers of Christ. The words "till the Son of Man come," in Matthew x. 23, recall at once Daniel vii. 13, "there came with the clouds of heaven one like a Son of Man"; and the similar teaching in the Book of Enoch, quoted in my first paper. This reminiscence is confirmed by the frequent use in the Synoptist Gospels of the term *Son of Man* in reference to His return to judge the

world. (See below.) That in the casual allusion before us the word "come" is considered sufficiently definite to indicate our Lord's meaning, proves that His coming was already familiar to His disciples.

The coming of Christ is depicted in plain language in Matthew xiii. 40-43: "So will it be at the completion of the age. The Son of Man will send His angels, and they will gather out of His kingdom all the snares and those that do lawlessness, and will cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be the wailing and the gnashing of teeth. Then the righteous will shine forth as the sun in the Kingdom of their Father."

Still more definite is Matthew xvi. 27, 28: "The Son of Man will come in the glory of His Father with His angels; and then He will give back to each according to his action. Verily, I say to you, there are some of those standing here who will not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in His kingdom." Notice here twice the term *Son of Man*. The *coming* mentioned in verse 27 is evidently Christ's coming to judge the world: for only then "will He give to each one according to his action." And it is difficult to give any other meaning to the words "see the Son of Man coming" in the next verse. Yet nothing happened during the lifetime of the men then standing around Christ which could fairly and intelligibly be described by the words "see the Son of Man coming in His Kingdom." Certainly there was no visible coming of Christ, as some have suggested, at the destruction of Jerusalem.

This serious difficulty is, I think, somewhat relieved by a comparison with the parallel passages in the Second and Third Gospels. In Mark ix. 1, Christ is represented as saying "until they see the Kingdom of God having come in power." The Greek perfect *ἐληλυθειαν* describes the abiding effect of the coming of the Kingdom of God. In Luke ix. 27 we read simply "till they see the kingdom of God."

Now the general context, and especially the words "there are some of those standing here who will not taste death till they see," which are found almost word for word in each of the Synoptists, leave no room for doubt that the three are reports of the same discourse of Christ. But we notice that, whereas Matthew¹ speaks of seeing "the Son of Man coming in His Kingdom," Luke speaks only of seeing "the Kingdom of God," and Mark of seeing "the kingdom of God come in power." The second and third phrases describe correctly the events of the day of Pentecost. On that day, the Apostles, who a few months before had heard, standing by Christ, the words now before us, saw the Kingdom of God actually set up on earth in a manner unknown before, and amid a wonderful manifestation of the power of God. If this exposition be correct, the coming of the Son of Man in Mark viii. 38 and the coming of the Kingdom of God in the next verse (so Luke ix. 26, 27) refer to different events: and this is permitted or suggested by the different words used, by each Evangelist, in the consecutive verses. On the other hand, in Matthew xvi. 27, 28, the similar phraseology suggests irresistibly a reference, in both verses, to the same event.

The only explanation of all this, which I can suggest, is that of the three reports before us the second and third, which are practically the same, reproduce more correctly the words actually spoken by Christ; and that the account given in the First Gospel was coloured by the eager hope of the early followers of Christ for their Master's speedy return.

The hope thus expressed has important apologetic value. For no writer or compiler in the second century, when the last survivor of the days of Christ had long ago passed away,

¹ The use of the names "Matthew" and "Mark" to distinguish the Gospels is merely conventional. My argument does not involve any assumption about the authorship of the Gospels.

would have represented Christ as saying that some around Him would survive His coming to judge the world. Consequently the passage before us is a sure indication of the early date of the First Gospel; and the early date, thus proved, greatly increases its value as a witness of what Christ actually did and said. If our Lord spoke the words attributed to Him in the Second and Third Gospels, we can easily understand how His contemporaries, confusing two distinct events, each of which was then hidden in the unknown future, attributed to Him the words recorded in Matthew xvi. 27, 28, words differing in form so little, though in meaning so much, from those which He seems to have actually used. But this confusion would have been impossible after our Lord's meaning had been made clear by events. This important evidence abundantly compensates for the difficulty now before us.

In Matthew x. 23 Christ enjoins His disciples when persecuted in one city to flee to another; and supports His injunction by adding, "For verily, I say to you, ye will not have completed the cities of Israel till the Son of Man come." These words, which have no parallel in the other Synoptists, are not, like chapter xvi. 28, an explicit assertion, but only a casual allusion. It is, however, an allusion which could not have been made after the land of Israel had for more than a generation been depopulated of its ancient inhabitants. It is therefore another sure mark of the very early date of the First Gospel.

In Luke xvii. 22-37, a passage which has no exact counterpart in the other Synoptists, although containing verses which have close parallels there, we read, in close agreement with 2 Thessalonians i. 7, of the "day when the Son of Man is *revealed*." This day is compared, in Luke xvii. 26, to the "day when Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came and took them all away"; and in verse 29 to the "day when Lot went forth from Sodom, and it rained fire

Now the general context, and especially the words "there are some of those standing here who will not taste death till they see," which are found almost word for word in each of the Synoptists, leave no room for doubt that the three are reports of the same discourse of Christ. But we notice that, whereas Matthew ¹ speaks of seeing "the Son of Man coming in His Kingdom," Luke speaks only of seeing "the Kingdom of God," and Mark of seeing "the kingdom of God come in power." The second and third phrases describe correctly the events of the day of Pentecost. On that day, the Apostles, who a few months before had heard, standing by Christ, the words now before us, saw the Kingdom of God actually set up on earth in a manner unknown before, and amid a wonderful manifestation of the power of God. If this exposition be correct, the coming of the Son of Man in Mark viii. 38 and the coming of the Kingdom of God in the next verse (so Luke ix. 26, 27) refer to different events: and this is permitted or suggested by the different words used, by each Evangelist, in the consecutive verses. On the other hand, in Matthew xvi. 27, 28, the similar phraseology suggests irresistibly a reference, in both verses, to the same event.

The only explanation of all this, which I can suggest, is that of the three reports before us the second and third, which are practically the same, reproduce more correctly the words actually spoken by Christ; and that the account given in the First Gospel was coloured by the eager hope of the early followers of Christ for their Master's speedy return.

The hope thus expressed has important apologetic value. For no writer or compiler in the second century, when the last survivor of the days of Christ had long ago passed away,

¹ The use of the names "Matthew" and "Mark" to distinguish the Gospels is merely conventional. My argument does not involve any assumption about the authorship of the Gospels.

would have represented Christ as saying that some around Him would survive His coming to judge the world. Consequently the passage before us is a sure indication of the early date of the First Gospel; and the early date, thus proved, greatly increases its value as a witness of what Christ actually did and said. If our Lord spoke the words attributed to Him in the Second and Third Gospels, we can easily understand how His contemporaries, confusing two distinct events, each of which was then hidden in the unknown future, attributed to Him the words recorded in Matthew xvi. 27, 28, words differing in form so little, though in meaning so much, from those which He seems to have actually used. But this confusion would have been impossible after our Lord's meaning had been made clear by events. This important evidence abundantly compensates for the difficulty now before us.

In Matthew x. 23 Christ enjoins His disciples when persecuted in one city to flee to another; and supports His injunction by adding, "For verily, I say to you, ye will not have completed the cities of Israel till the Son of Man come." These words, which have no parallel in the other Synoptists, are not, like chapter xvi. 28, an explicit assertion, but only a casual allusion. It is, however, an allusion which could not have been made after the land of Israel had for more than a generation been depopulated of its ancient inhabitants. It is therefore another sure mark of the very early date of the First Gospel.

In Luke xvii. 22-37, a passage which has no exact counterpart in the other Synoptists, although containing verses which have close parallels there, we read, in close agreement with 2 Thessalonians i. 7, of the "day when the Son of Man is *revealed*." This day is compared, in Luke xvii. 26, to the "day when Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came and took them all away"; and in verse 29 to the "day when Lot went forth from Sodom, and it rained fire

and brimstone from heaven and destroyed all." Our Lord thus teaches, in close agreement with 1 Thessalonians v. 3, that His coming will be to the wicked a sudden and overwhelming destruction; and, as Paul teaches more fully in 2 Thessalonians ii. 9, 10, that it will be preceded by general demoralisation.

The important and difficult parallel chapters, Matthew xxiv., Mark xiii., and Luke xxi. 5-36, demand now careful study.

In all three Synoptists, the discourse is introduced by the disciples showing to Christ the beautiful buildings of the temple, and by Christ's reply that the time will come when of those buildings not one stone will be left upon another. The disciples ask Him, (some time afterwards and sitting upon the Mount of Olives, as Matthew and Mark narrate,) "When shall these things be?" To this question Matthew adds another, "What shall be the sign of Thy coming (*παρουσία*) and of the end of the age?" The word *παρουσία* recalls at once the same word used frequently by Paul, in a technical sense, for the return of Christ to judge the world. The phrase "completion of the age" we have found already in Matthew xiii. 39, 40, 49, denoting the close of the present order of things by the final judgment; and in chapter xxviii. 20, denoting the close of the evangelical activity of the servants of Christ. The use elsewhere of the terms *παρουσία* and *completion of the age* suggests irresistibly that both refer to one event, and to the event to which the former term refers when used by St. Paul.

To these questions, our Lord replies by words of warning, "See that no one deceive you"; and then opens to His disciples a vista of tumults and persecutions, concluding with an announcement, "This Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a testimony to all the nations: and then shall come the end." The word *τέλος*

refers evidently to the *συντελεία τοῦ αἰῶνος* about which the disciples had questioned their Master.

Next follows a practical and positive direction. The sign given by Matthew and Mark is "the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place," or "where it must not" stand: that given by Luke is "Jerusalem surrounded by camps." But in all three the injunction is the same, with one trifling exception, word for word: "Then let those in Judæa flee to the mountains." Then follows (Matthew and Mark) unheard-of tribulation; and (Luke) slaughter and the people carried away captive to all lands, and "Jerusalem trodden under foot by Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." These last words suggest that the destruction of the city will be followed by a long period of desolation.

After these words, Luke represents Christ as announcing the dissolution of nature and the appearance of the Son of Man in the sky. Matthew and Mark give a warning against false-Christis and false-prophets, and add "immediately after the tribulation of those days" (Matthew) or "in those days, after that tribulation" (Mark) "the sun shall be darkened . . . and then shall they see the Son of Man coming in the clouds." The appearance of Christ will be followed, as He teaches here and elsewhere in these Gospels, by the sending forth of His angels to gather together His people from the ends of the earth.

An important turning point common to the three accounts of this discourse is found in Matthew xxiv. 32, Mark xiii. 28, Luke xxi. 29, in the parable of the fig tree putting forth its young shoots as harbingers of approaching summer. In each account, this parable is followed by the assertion, given in almost identical words, "Verily I say to you, this generation shall not pass away until all these things take place." The word *γενεά* can refer only to the men living in Christ's day. And, at first sight, the words "all these things"

seem to include the appearance of Christ from heaven. But this first impression is somewhat modified by the verse following, which is the same almost word for word in the First and Second Gospels: "But about that day and hour, no one knoweth, not even the angels of heaven, neither the Son, except My Father only." For, in these words, the day of Christ's return, which is unknown even to the Son, is placed in conspicuous contrast to events which will happen during the present generation. The colourless English rendering "*that day*" poorly reproduces the emphasis of the Greek pronoun *ἐκεῖνης*, which points conspicuously to something at a distance from the speaker. This contrasted collocation suggests that the "all these things" in Matthew xxiv. 34, Mark xiii. 30, refer to the fall of Jerusalem, and the verse following to the Second Coming of Christ. This explanation, however, does not apply to the Third Gospel, which has no parallel to the verse in question.

The above explanations remove the difficulty before us, even in the First and Second Gospels, only partially. All three reports of this important discourse of Christ seem to be coloured by the eager hopes of the first generation of the followers of Christ. And this colouring bears witness to the very early date of the tradition embodied in the Synoptist Gospels.

Then follows in Matthew and Mark a comparison of the coming of Christ to the flood, similar to that recorded, in an earlier period of our Lord's ministry, in Luke xvii. 26, 27; and in all three Gospels a warning to watch.

As the Bridegroom in the parable of the Ten Virgins, the coming of Christ is mentioned again in Matthew xxv. 10: and we notice that He is represented as lingering; another indication of delay in Christ's return, among indications that His return was close at hand. This apparent contradiction is easily explained by the uncertainty of the early Christians

about an eagerly-expected event still future. A similar indication of delay is found in verse 19: "After a long time the lord of those servants cometh." The whole parable refers evidently to Christ's coming in the Day of Judgment.

In verses 31-46 we have another description of the coming of Christ to judge all men good and bad: "When the Son of Man shall come in His glory, and all the angels with Him, then He shall sit upon the throne of His glory, and before Him shall be gathered all the nations, and He shall separate them one from another as the shepherd separateth the sheep from the goats."

The coming of Christ to judge the world is one of the most conspicuous features of the First Gospel. And, with the exception of somewhat varying indications of the earlier or later time of His return, the picture is harmonious throughout. Equally harmonious, and scarcely less conspicuous, is the teaching of the Second and Third Gospels. Still more remarkable, considering the wide difference in forms of expression and modes of thought between the Synoptist Gospels, especially the First Gospel, on the one hand, and the Epistles of Paul on the other, is the close agreement, both in thought and diction, of all these documents touching the matter before us. The only real differences are that the hope of an early return of Christ, which in the Epistles of Paul finds only faint expression in two ambiguous passages, finds in the Synoptist Gospels, especially in the First Gospel, much more definite expression; and that the new and terrible form of evil foretold by Paul is by the Evangelists only suggested in a comparison of the days before Christ's return with those before the flood. The eager desire of His followers anticipated their Lord's return as close at hand: but the sober thought of Paul warns them that before the coming of Christ there must come first an embodiment of evil in its most awful form.

The same teaching about the return of Christ is found,

though less conspicuously, in the Book of Acts. In chapter i. 11, angels announce to the disciples on Olivet, "this Jesus, who has been taken up from you into heaven, will so come in the manner in which ye saw Him going into heaven." In Acts iii. 19-21, St. Peter sets before his hearers a hope "that there may come times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord, and that He may send Christ Jesus, fore-appointed for you, whom heaven must needs receive until the times of restitution of all things." He speaks again in chapter x. 42 of Jesus as "ordained by God Judge of men living and dead." Similarly St. Paul at Athens, as recorded in Acts xvii. 31, preached that God had "set a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness by a Man whom He has ordained." In chapter xxiv. 15 he expresses a hope that there "will be a resurrection of both righteous and unrighteous."

Similar thought and phraseology are found in James v. 7-9: "Be patient, brethren, till the *coming* (*παρουσία*) of the Lord . . . the *coming* of the Lord has come near . . . the Judge stands before the door." The phraseology and thought of St. Paul are found also in 1 Peter i. 5, "salvation ready to be revealed at the last time"; and in *vv.* 7, 13, "in the revelation of Jesus Christ." So again in chapter iv. 5-7, "who will give account to Him that is ready to judge living men and dead. . . . The end of all things has come near." And *v.* 13, "that, at the revelation of His glory, ye may rejoice exultingly." Also chapter v. 1., a sharer of the glory about to be revealed"; and *v.* 4, "when the chief Shepherd is manifested, ye shall receive the unfading crown of glory." These passages prove that the thought and phraseology of St. Paul were shared by the Galilean Apostles.

The harmonious testimony of these various and different witnesses affords complete proof, apart from any special authority of Holy Scripture, that Jesus of Nazareth an-

nounced that He will return visibly from heaven to earth to close the present order of things and to pronounce and execute judgment on all men good and bad; that He taught that at His coming evil will be prevalent on earth, and that consequently to some men His appearance will bring sudden destruction, but to the righteous deliverance and eternal blessing. The exact time of His return, Christ did not specify. But He spoke words which evoked in the hearts of some of His disciples a hope that some then living would survive His coming. St. Paul, however, taught that the Day of the Lord was not at hand, and that before Christ comes some new and terrible form of evil will first appear. That Christ left in the minds of some of His disciples this hope of an early return, and that He actually and conspicuously taught that He will come to close the present order of things and to judge all men living and dead, must be accepted, on reliable documentary evidence as an assured result of New Testament scholarship.

In my next paper I shall consider the teaching of the Johannine Writings.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

ST. PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY.

XX. THE CHURCH.

It is natural that one should desire to know what is taught in the Pauline letters, and especially in the controversial group, on the subject of the Church, and in what relation the Pauline idea of the Church stands to the idea of the Kingdom of God so prominent in the teaching of Christ as reported in the Synoptical Gospels.

As to the latter topic, for we may begin with it, it is to be noted that both ideas, Church and Kingdom, and the terms corresponding, occur both in Synoptic Gospels, and in Paul-

ine Epistles, but in an inverse order of prominence. The Kingdom is the leading idea in our Lord's teaching; the Church is named only twice in the Evangelic narratives, and the question has been discussed whether Jesus ever used the word at all, or even contemplated the thing. The Church, on the other hand, is the leading category in St. Paul's epistles; the Kingdom of God is mentioned only five times in the four great epistles, while the terms "Church" and "Churches" occur many times. From these facts the natural inference might seem to be that in the view both of Jesus and of Paul, the Kingdom and the Church were practically equivalent, the Church being the ideal of the Kingdom realized; from Christ's point of view the ideal to be realized in the future, therefore rarely mentioned; from Paul's point of view the ideal already realized, therefore most frequently spoken of. Broadly viewed, this is the truth. Yet the statement must be taken with qualification, for neither in the teaching of our Lord nor in that of St. Paul do the two conceptions exactly cover each other. In both the Kingdom possesses a certain transcendental character not belonging to the Church. This amounts to saying that it is a pure ideal hovering over the reality, or in advance of it, a goal which the Church seeks to approximate, but never overtakes. Along with this transcendent character goes an *apocalyptic* aspect revealing itself in Evangelic and Pauline representations of the Kingdom. These two attributes of transcendency and futurity are very recognisable in the passages referring to the Kingdom in the Pauline letters. The eschatological aspect is apparent in the texts, *Gal.* v. 21; *1 Cor.* vi. 9, 10; *1 Cor.* xv. 50, in the two former of which it is declared concerning men guilty of certain specified sins, that they shall not inherit the Kingdom, while in the latter the same declaration is made concerning *flesh* and *blood*, that is our present mortal corruptible bodies. The transcendent character of the Kingdom is plainly implied in

the remaining two texts in which it is mentioned, 1 *Cor.* iv. 20 and *Rom.* xiv. 17. "Not in word," says the Apostle in the former place, "(is) the kingdom of God, but in power." It is clear that for the writer of such a sentence, at the moment, the Kingdom is not identical with the Church, but something rising far above it in ideal purity, and beauty, and dignity. For the statement quoted could not have been made concerning the Church as represented by the Christian community in Corinth. The very opposite was the truth as regarded it. The Church at Corinth was in word not in power. It was a society wholly given up to talk, to oratory, to prophesying, to speaking with tongues. The one phenomenon visible there was a universally diffused talent for speech; there was a sad dearth of all that tends to give a religious community spiritual power, of wisdom and charity, or even common morality. A state of things like that would compel one to distinguish between Church and Kingdom, and to think of the latter as exalted above the former as far as heaven is above the earth. Similar observations apply to the other text, which runs: "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit." The obvious meaning is that in the Kingdom ritual cleanness and uncleanness are of no account; nothing is of value there that is merely ceremonial, nothing but the moral and spiritual; the qualification for citizenship is not eating or abstaining from eating a given sort of food, but possessing a righteous, loving, sunny spirit; the men to whom belongs the Kingdom are those who have a passion for righteousness, who are peacemakers, and who can rejoice even in tribulation, because they have chosen God for their *summum bonum*.

The very fact that the apostle thought it needful to make the observation just commented on, proves that the Church of Rome was far enough from realizing the idea of a community in which questions about meats and drinks were

nothing, and righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit everything. There were in it, on the one hand, many whose consciences were enslaved by petty scruples, and on the other, many who treated such scruples with contempt; consequently there prevailed a great forgetfulness in opposite directions of the great things of the law: justice, mercy, and faith. Such a state of matters is a disappointing and depressing spectacle wherever exhibited, and the soul of a good man naturally takes to itself wings of a dove, and flies away in quest of a refuge from despair and scepticism to the fair Kingdom of Heaven, where naught but what is noble and benignant and bright finds entrance. It is well for one who lives in evil times to be able thus mentally to see the transcendent commonwealth. It is his salvation from unbelief, his quietive amid disgusts, his consolation amid disappointments and disenchantments; a temple wherein he may behold the beauty of the Lord, when there is nowhere else anything beautiful to look upon; a pavilion in which he can hide himself in the time of trouble. There is no other refuge than the Church transcendent. However disappointing any particular religious society may be, it is not worth while to leave it for any other. The Church at Corinth was bad, but the Church at Rome was also far from perfect. In the one was licentious liberty, in the other religious narrowness and petty scrupulosity. Therefore a truly Christ-like man whose lot was cast in either might well say: "I had rather bear the ills I have than fly to others that I know not of." St. Paul's comfort in reference to both was to lift up his thoughts to the transcendent Kingdom of God.

It thus appears that in the mind of the apostle the divine Kingdom was by no means immediately identical with the Christian Church. Yet, while this is true, it is at the same time also true that in his writings we observe a constant effort to contemplate the Church in the bright light of the

ideal, and not merely in the dim, disenchanting light of vulgar reality. He desired ever to invest the Church with the attributes of the divine Kingdom, and loved to think of it as a glorious Church, without spot of defilement or wrinkles of age, holy, free from blemish, as became the bride of Christ.¹ Various traces of this idealizing tendency are discoverable in the leading epistles. First we may note the generalizing conception of the Church as a *unity*. Sometimes the apostle speaks of churches in the plural, as in *Galatians* i. 2, where he salutes "the Churches of Galatia," and in i. 22, where he states that he was unknown to "the Churches of Judæa." The Churches in these texts are little communities of Christians in different towns who associated together as believers in Jesus, and met in one place for divine worship. In other texts the apostle uses the word "Church" collectively to denote the whole body of believers, as in *Galatians* i. 13, where he persistently refers to the time when he persecuted "the Church of God," and in 1 *Corinthians* x. 32, where he counsels the Christians in Corinth to give no occasion of stumbling to Jews or to Greeks, or to the Church of God, where it is clear, from the reference to Jews and Greeks, that he has a wide public in view, the whole world, in fact, divided into three classes: the Jews, the Gentiles represented by the Greeks, these two embracing all unbelievers, and the Church, embracing all believers.

Another indication of the tendency to invest the Church with the ideal attributes of the divine Kingdom may be found in the representation of the Church as a society in which all outward distinctions are cancelled, and the sole qualification for membership is purely spiritual—union to Christ by faith. The conception of the new humanity in which Christ is all and in all occurs chiefly in the later

¹ *Ephes.* v. 27. The epistle, whether one of St. Paul's or not, utters here genuinely Pauline sentiment.

epistles, especially in that to the Ephesians, but it is found also in the earlier, very distinctly in *Galatians* iii. 27, 28: "As many of you as were baptized into Christ put on Christ. There is (in Him) neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor freeman, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Here is sketched a spiritual society in which nothing is taken into account but the personal relation of each member to the common object of faith. While the attribute of spirituality is accentuated, the kindred attribute of universality is plainly implied. There is neither Jew, Greek, bond, free, male and female, because all are there together. This new society of the apostles, like the Kingdom of Jesus, is open to all comers, just because it negates all distinctions, and insists only on the one condition of faith possible for all alike. It may here be noted that the expression, "the Israel of God," used in the close of the Epistle to the Galatians, shows how closely the ideas of the Church and the Kingdom were connected in the writer's mind. The new creation presented to view in the Christian Church was for him the ideal commonwealth whereof the theocratic kingdom of Israel was an adumbration.

One other indication of this idealizing tendency is to be found in the high moral attributes ascribed by St. Paul to the members of the Church. Though not unaware of the prevalent shortcoming in faith and life, he nevertheless speaks of the members of the various Churches as "saints," sanctified, holy. Even the Corinthian Christians are saluted as "sanctified in Christ Jesus,"¹ and the title saints is extended to all Christians in the province of Achaia.² This might seem to be a mere matter of courtesy, did we not find in the body of the first Epistle to the Corinthians a deliberate statement to the effect that the members of the Church were a body of sanctified men, a statement rendered

¹ 1 Cor. i. 2.

² 2 Cor. i. 1.

all the more emphatic by the plainness with which the apostle indicates that the Corinthians had been the reverse of holy before they became converts to the Christian religion. "Such were some of you, but ye were washed, but ye were sanctified." ¹

From the foregoing discussion we have obtained a sufficiently clear general idea of the Christian Church as conceived by St. Paul. It is a society of men united by a common faith in Jesus Christ as the Saviour, and a common devotion to Him as their Lord, gathered together from all classes, conditions, and races of men. It does not need to be said that the members of such a society would have very close fellowship with each other. There is no brotherhood so intimate and precious as one based on a pure religion sincerely professed. It may be taken for granted that those who belong to such a brotherhood will avail themselves of all possible opportunities of meeting together for the interchange of thought and affection in mutual converse, and for united worship of the common object of faith, and for ministering to each other's wants and comforts. The Westminster Confession says: "Saints by profession are *bound* to maintain an holy fellowship and communion in the worship of God, and in performing such other spiritual services as tend to their mutual edification; as also in relieving each other in outward things, according to their several abilities and necessities."² In the initial period of fresh enthusiasm, Christians would do all this instinctively without needing to be told it was their duty.

Accordingly, we are not surprised to find in the letters of St. Paul to the Churches he had planted traces of a very lively fellowship in worship, religious intercourse, and mutual benefit prevalent among those bearing the Christian name. They met together in public assembly, how often does not appear, but certainly at least once a week,

¹ 1 Cor. vi. 11.

² Chap. xxvi. 2.

and on the first day of the week; and when they met they prayed, sang, prophesied for mutual edification. They also ate together, and while doing so they set apart a portion of the bread and wine to be memorials of Christ's death, and partook of these with reverent, grateful thoughts of Him who died for them, and in token of mutual love to each other as His disciples.¹ At first, apparently, all members of the community took part indiscriminately in the religious exercises. Every one had his psalm, his doctrine, his revelation, or his still more mysterious utterance called a tongue (*γλωσσαι*), or his interpretation of a brother's tongue. All were on a level: there was perfect equality of privilege, unrestricted liberty of speech for the common good. It is easy to see that in a city like Corinth, among an excitable race like the Greeks, a religious meeting conducted in this manner would be more lively than orderly. It would not be long before a need for some little measure of order and organization would be felt, a need for dividing the Church into two classes: those, on the one hand, who would best serve the brotherhood by silence, and those, on the other, whose special business it should be to contribute to the common benefit by speech. The question, who were to be silent and who were to speak, would settle itself by a process of natural selection. It would be seen by degrees who could speak to profit and who could not, and means would be found for silencing the unprofitable speaker and for giving those who could speak profitably the position of a recognised teacher. In a similar way spontaneous differentiation would take place in reference to other gifts, and certain persons would gradually come to be recognised as possessing the charism of healing, of succouring the needy, of government, and so on. Recognition would follow

¹ Weizsäcker thinks that this took place at a separate meeting from that at which the ordinary worship was carried on. (Vide *Das apostolische Zeitalter*, p. 548 f.).

experimental proof of possession of the function. The honour of recognition would be the reward of service actually rendered. For in the primitive Church the law enunciated by Christ, distinction to be reached through service, was thoroughly understood and acted on. The law is clearly proclaimed in St. Paul's epistles. He represents the Church as an organism like the human body, wherein each part has a function to perform for the good of the whole, and in which, if one part has more honour than another, it is because of its serviceableness.¹

How far the process of differentiation into distinctiveness of function, and of corresponding recognition of fitness for distinct functions had been carried at the time the four great epistles were written it is not easy to determine. It seems pretty certain that by that time an order of teachers had arisen, but it is not so clear that all the communities were furnished with an order of rulers. No certain trace of such an order can be discovered in the sources of information concerning the Churches of Galatia and Corinth. One might indeed suppose that 1 *Corinthians* xvi. 15, 16 contained a reference to something of the kind. "I beseech you, brethren, (ye know the house of Stephanas, that it is the firstfruits of Achaia, and that they gave themselves for service to the saints,) that ye also be in subjection to such, and to every fellow-worker and labourer." But this is too vague an exhortation to serve as a proof text, especially when it is remembered that in connection with the case of immoral conduct in the Corinthian Church the apostle does not anywhere summon church rulers to exercise needful discipline, but simply appeals to the congregation to purge themselves of complicity with the sin. A more reliable indication of the existence of a ruling function in rudimentary form is to be found in what we have reason to regard as the earliest of the Pauline epistles, the first to the Thessalonians.

¹ 1 *Cor.* xii. 12-26.

In that epistle (v. 12) the apostle exhorts the Thessalonian Church to know those that laboured among them, and *were over them in the Lord* (προϊσταμένους) and admonished them. A real authority is doubtless here pointed at, only we are not to conceive of it as of an official character originating in ecclesiastical ordination. It arose naturally and spontaneously, probably out of priority in faith, or from the fact that the προϊσταμένοι held the meetings of the congregation in their own houses and with the expenditure of their own means.¹

As regards *teachers* on the other hand, distinct allusions to such an order occur in the leading epistles. The apostle thus exhorts the Galatians: "Let him that is taught in the word—the catechumen—communicate unto him that teacheth (τῷ κατηχοῦντι) in all good things." The exhortation seems to imply not only the existence of teachers, but of teachers who gave their whole time to the work, and therefore needed to be supported by the Church. In Corinth the position of teacher was occupied by Apollos, to whom reference is made in 1 *Corinthians* iii. 4. That Apollos was more than an occasional speaker, even a regular instructor, is evident from the terms in which the apostle speaks of him. Claiming for himself the function of planter, he assigns to Apollos the function of watering, a task which in its nature requires to be performed systematically. In

¹ Vide on this Weizsäcker's *Apostolic Age*, vol. i. p. 291. The reader may also consult two articles by Heinrici in the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1876, 1877, on *Die Christengemeinde Korinths und die religiösen Genossenschaften der Griechen*, and *Zur Geschichte der Anfänge Paulinischen Gemeinde*. Heinrici's view is that the Gentile churches founded by Paul were not modelled on the Jewish synagogue but assumed the characteristics of the religious associations of the Pagan world. These as they existed in Greece, according to Heinrici, "bore a purely republican character. All members possessed the same rights, all were expected to show equal zeal. All were alike sovereign and alike responsible. The collective body ruled, resolved, rewarded, punished." *Zeitschrift f. w. T.*, p. 501. The προϊστάμενος mentioned in 1 *Thessalonians* v. 12 and in *Romans* xii. 8 Heinrici compares to the *patronus* of an association who as a person of influence guarded its legal rights.

1 *Corinthians* iv. he describes both Apollos and himself as servants of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God, phrases implying that both exercised functions of great importance, the one as a founder of churches moving about from land to land, the other as a stationary instructor in a particular church.

But the passage which beyond all others shows what an importance and dignity belonged to the teaching ministry in St. Paul's esteem is that in 2 *Corinthians*, where he describes himself as a fit servant of the New Testament.¹ It is implied that it is no small matter to be a fit minister of the Christian religion. That this is the thought in the apostle's mind is proved by the fact that, having claimed for himself to be such a minister, he goes on to pronounce a eulogium on the Christian dispensation in impassioned language, describing it as the religion of the spirit, the dispensation of life, the ministration of righteousness, and in virtue of these attributes as the abiding perennial religion, as opposed to the transient religion of the old covenant. He claims for himself fitness for the service of this new order of things, basing his claims on his ability to appreciate the distinctive excellence and glory of the New Testament, an ability for which he is indebted to his whole past religious experience. And the service which he has in view is just the preaching of the gospel; for in the foregoing context he repudiates all complicity in the arts of those who huckster the word of God, and in the following he protests that if his gospel be hid it is hid from them that are lost. So then it is the word of God that is concerned in this New Testament service, it is the preaching of the gospel in which the service consists.

But it may be thought that this eulogy of the New Testament and by implication of its ministry, affects only the preaching of an apostle, and cannot legitimately be extended

¹ 2 *Cor.* iii. 6.

to an ordinary gospel ministry. This inference however is contrary to the spirit, I may say even to the language, of the passage in question. For it is observable that the apostle employs the plural pronoun throughout, as if, while asserting his own importance against assailants,¹ with express intent to include others, like Apollos, Titus and Timothy, in his eulogy. Then it is to be noted that at the end of the chapter the expression "we" is replaced by "we all,"² in which the writer certainly has in view more than himself. But indeed no one who enters into the drift of the argument throughout can possibly imagine that St. Paul is thinking merely of his own apostleship when he speaks of the ministry of the New Testament. The kind of argument he uses to defend his apostleship is such as to serve a wider purpose, *viz.*, to legitimise the ministry of all who with unveiled face see the glory of Christ and of Christianity. For him the ultimate ground of a right to preach is insight into the genius of the New Testament religion. That carries with it the right of every one who has the insight. Whoever has the open eye and the unveiled face may take part in the ministry. "The tools to him that can use them" was a principle for St. Paul as well as for Napoleon. He that had the open eye was, in his judgment, not only entitled but bound to take part in the New Testament ministry. God made the sun in order that it might shine, and He gives the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus to Christian men that they in turn may be lights to the world.

There is another thing in this great passage which clearly shows that in the writer's view a teaching or preaching ministry was a most congenial and fitting feature of the New Testament dispensation. It is the remark about

¹ For the bearing of the whole passage on the defence of St. Paul's apostolic standing against the Judaists *vide* Art. iv. in this series.

² 2 Cor. iii. 18.

παρρησία: "seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech."¹ The frankness with which the apostle is wont to utter himself as a preacher he here connects with the hopeful character of the faith he preaches, which is a feature naturally rising out of all the others previously mentioned. The religion of the Spirit of life and of righteousness cannot but be a religion of good hope. But a religion of good hope is sure to be a religion of free speech. For it puts men in good spirits, it gives them heart to speak, it makes them feel that they have good news to tell. Who would care to be a preaching minister of a religion of condemnation and despair and death? But how pleasant to be the messenger of mercy, the publisher of good tidings! How beautiful are the feet of them that preach a gospel of peace; beautiful because they move so nimbly and gracefully, as no feet can move but those of him that goes on a glad errand. It may be taken for granted that under a religion of good hope great will be the company of preachers characterized by *παρρησία*, boldness, frankness. The more the better, St. Paul would have said, provided they be of the right kind, men in sympathy with the new era of grace and the genius of the New Testament; hopeful, outspoken, eloquent, as only those can be who are at once sincere and happy. To men of another spirit, gloomy, reserved, prudential, he would have said: You are not fit for this ministry; you are fit only for a ministry like that of Moses, who put a veil on his face. You are living not in the new era, but in the old one, which I for my part am glad to be done with. Go and take service under the Levitical system; you are of no use in the Christian Church.

The upshot of what has been said is that evangelism, frank, fervent speech about the common faith, may be expected as a prominent feature of organized Christianity, in proportion as the organization is filled with the spirit of St.

¹ 2 Cor. iii. 12.

Paul and of the apostolic age. Whether a systematically trained class of professional preachers be a legitimate development out of such evangelism is a question of grave concern for all the Churches in the present time. Preaching is a very outstanding feature in our church life, and all the modern Churches have with more or less decision adopted as their ideal "a learned ministry." Is the ideal justified by results? In reply I have to say that my sympathies are very strongly with the advocates of a learned ministry. In my view what we have to complain of is not that the Churches have adopted this as their ideal, but that the ministry turned out of their theological seminaries can only by courtesy be described as learned. What we need is not less learning but a great deal more, and of the right sort. At the same time it has to be acknowledged that the programme involves dangers. Learning may kill enthusiasm and transform the prophet into a Rabbi. That will mean decay of the evangelic spirit, lapse into legalism. This is the form in which the legal temper is apt to invade Churches which magnify the importance of the preacher. The bane of other Churches is sacramentarianism and priestcraft, under which prophetic *παρρησία* disappears and mystery takes its place. The bane to be dreaded by Churches not sacramentarian in tendency is a Rabinized pulpit, offering the people scholastic dogmas or philosophic ideas in place of the gospel. Religious teachers ought to know theology and to be deep, earnest, thinkers, but in the *concio ad populum* the prophet should be more prominent than the theologian, and the poet than the philosopher.

One other topic remains to be noticed briefly, the view presented in the Pauline epistles of the Church's relation to Christ. In the Christological epistles the Church is conceived as the body of Christ, He being the Head. This idea is found also in the controversial letters, more especially in 1 *Corinthians*. It is stated with great distinctness

in these words: "But ye are the body of Christ and members individually" (*ἐκ μέρους*);¹ well paraphrased by Stanley: "You, the Christian Society, as distinct from the bodily organization, of which I have just been speaking, you are, collectively speaking, the body of Christ, as individually you are His limbs." The value of this idea is the use made of it in assigning a *rationale* for the diversity of gifts in the Church. In order to a complete Church, such is the apostle's thought, there must be a great variety of gifts, just as there is a great variety of members in the human body. It would not be well if all had the same gifts, any more than if the whole body were an eye or an ear. There must be differentiation of function: apostles, prophets, teachers, gifts of healings, talent for administration, the power of speaking with tongues. The diversity need not create disorder. It finds its unity in Christ. "There are diversities of services, and the same Lord."² A splendid ideal, if only it were wisely and conscientiously worked out. But, alas, to carry out the programme there is wanted a spirit of self-abnegation and magnanimity such as animated the apostle Paul. We are so apt to imagine that our function is the only important or even legitimate one, and to regard men of other gifts as aliens and rebels. It is so hard to realize our own limits, and to see in our brethren the complement of our own defects; and to grasp the thought that it takes all Christians together, with all their diverse talents and graces, to shadow forth even imperfectly the fulness of wisdom and goodness that is in Christ.

A. B. BRUCE.

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 27.

² 1 Cor. xii. 5.

NAMES FOR SIN.

A STRIKING peculiarity of the vocabulary of Scripture is the variety of words for sin. In the New Testament these names are numerous, and in the Old Testament they are bewilderingly numerous. There is a good reason for this variety: it denotes that the subject is a many-sided one, and that the nature of sin is so complicated that it cannot be easily described. A study of some of the more significant of these terms, therefore, ought to be one way of bringing home the impression that sin is "exceeding sinful."

1. Perhaps the commonest word for sin in both the Old Testament and the New is one that signifies *missing the mark* (ἁμαρτάνω). As a slinger, when he threw a stone, or a warrior, when he hurled a javelin, might miss the object at which he aimed, so the language of the Bible suggests that in sinning we are missing our object; that is to say, there is a right and perfect mode of spending every moment and performing every action, but, when we are sinning, we are wasting our time and spoiling our opportunity. The application of this idea is more obvious if we think not of a single act, but of a lifetime of sin. A sinful life misses the mark; it is a failure. Every son of Adam is born to a high and noble destiny; God has sent him into the world to fill a certain sphere and to accomplish a certain work. But he who lives in sin misses his destiny; and he will miss the prize which ought to have been its reward.

A name for sin, expressive of almost the same idea, signifies *declining from the way*, or falling out of the way (ἐκπίπτωμα). Life is conceived as a straight, clearly prescribed path, such as Bunyan saw in his vision; and every sin is a stepping aside or falling out of the way. Here again, however, the idea becomes clearer when we think not of a single sin, but of a course of sin. Thus our Lord

Himself spoke of the path of the sinner : " Straight is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life ; but wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth unto destruction."

2. Another term frequently employed for sin denotes *the overleaping of a boundary* (*παράβασις.*) We express this idea ourselves, in English, when we speak of sins as transgressions or trespasses.

To miss the mark is a sign of lack of skill, and to stumble or stray out of the way is the act of a child ; so that the first name for sin designates it as something weak and childish. But to clear a barrier at a leap or to push it down is rather the work of excessive and uncontrolled strength ; and therefore this designates a totally different aspect of sin. There are sins of weakness, which we commit through ignorance and inexperience, and with a miserable feeling that we have missed the mark ; but there are also presumptuous sins, into which we are hurried by the violence of passion and the stubbornness of self-will ; and we burst every barrier that stands in our way.

The barriers are the laws of God. These are revealed in conscience and in the Word of God. They meet us here and they meet us there, and they say, Hitherto shalt thou come and no farther. They fence in certain regions from intrusion. But the wild lusts and passions of our nature desire to enter these enclosed places. We seem to hear airs of entrancing music coming from within ; fruits which look pleasant to the eye hang over the walls ; and by hook or by crook we must enter.

One of the strongest names in the New Testament for sin is *lawlessness* (*ἀνομία*). This does not mean that the sinner has escaped from the law ; for this no man can do. But it means that he is acting as if no law existed, and that all the sacred places, which were meant to be kept virgin and intact, are trampled and profaned by the brutish hoofs of passion.

3. No word for sin is more significant than one which literally signifies the *breaking of a covenant* (עֲשָׂה). In ancient times tribes were allied to one another by covenant: they marched together against their common enemies; but if, on such an occasion, one of them deserted its ally in face of the enemy and broke the covenant, this was rightly considered one of the greatest of wrongs. It is from such an incident that this name for sin is derived. Naturally we are in covenant with God; we belong to Him; He has made us for Himself, and He expects us to spend our life in His love and fellowship. But many forget God and live as if he did not exist. Some go further: they remember that He exists, but they do not love Him; they would banish Him from their thoughts if they could, because He is the Being from whom they seem to themselves to have most to fear. Thus they almost hate Him and wish that He did not exist. Perhaps they go further still: they persuade themselves that there is no God, and argue against the Divine existence; but the wish is father to the thought.

This may be considered the gravest of all views of sin, because it brings out the fact that sin is directed against God Himself. It is a personal transaction between man and God. The law is an abstraction; and the sense that we have broken it may leave us cold. But, when we realise that sin touches God—that it is a breaking away from His friendship and an insult to His honour—that every sin we commit abides in God's memory, and grieves Him at His heart—we are brought face to face with Him with whom we have to do.

The three names already mentioned describe sin in relation to objects outside ourselves; the three that follow indicate its effects upon the sinner.

4. The fourth name designates sin as *disharmony* or *disorder* (עֲשָׂה, רָשָׁע). The different powers of human nature

were intended by the Creator to co-exist in friendly co-operation ; but sin transmutes them into forces ranged on opposing sides and fighting among themselves. "The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh." Every one is aware of the existence in himself of a nobler self, which aspires, and a baser self, which grovels. These are in continual conflict. Even the heathen have felt this disharmony, describing human nature as a chariot drawn by two steeds, the one of which is white and good-tempered, and would pull straight forward in the upward path, while the other is black in colour and evil in temper, and is continually breaking over the traces. But the apostle Paul has given the classical account of this struggle in Romans vii., in terms to the truth of which every human heart bears witness : "For that which I do I allow not ; for what I would, that do I not ; but what I hate, that do I." "For I delight in the law of the Lord after the inward man : but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. Oh wretched man that I am ! who shall deliver me from the body of this death ?"

5. A fifth name for sin, akin to the last, is *folly* (אָוִיל, etc.). The idea that sin is folly runs through the whole of both the Old Testament and the New.

The truth of this representation is easily demonstrated. The aim of all sin is to secure happiness. But God has clearly made known where and how true happiness is to be found. Not only has He declared it ; but in the very constitution of the world and of human nature He has appointed it. In the structure of the creation the lines are laid down on which life must move if it is to attain true success and permanent well-being. Now, sin is a deliberate contradiction of this divine decree. It is founded on the belief that we may go right in the teeth of this divine appointment, and yet be happy. Is not this folly ? Only

if God be a liar can such hopes be fulfilled, or if He is unable to carry out what He has threatened.

This may be why sin is often called in Scripture *a lie* (𐤀𐤏, etc.). It is a delusion. It promises happiness, when it means to inflict misery; it promises freedom, when it is bringing us into bondage; it promises glory, whilst it is sinking us into degradation. It is a kind of madness; and, therefore, our Lord said in the parable that the prodigal returned to his father "when he came to himself."

6. It is no great step to the sixth word, which signifies *misfortune* or *calamity* (𐤅𐤂, *κακόν*). When the glamour of sin is in the eyes of the prodigal and, intoxicated with its fumes, he is madly pursuing his way, little does he dream that what he is so blindly in love with is his enemy; yet it is only a question of time when the fact will be brought home even to his apprehension.

There are sins the course of which has been expressly designed by Providence to prove that sin is calamity; because they bring their own punishment in the eyes of all. Drunkenness is an example: the drunkard cannot conceal his sin; it soon tells even on his person; it wastes his substance; it impoverishes his home; it brings him to a premature and a dishonoured grave. More or less this is true of all sins of the flesh. Even civil society sees to it that some sins are turned into sufferings. The fraudulent operator rides for a time on the tide of success; he flaunts his wealth in the eyes of the world, and lives on the fat of the land; but at last sin rounds upon him; he is found out, and falls into the clutches of justice, when he becomes an example and a proverb.

But these glaring results of some sins are intended to demonstrate what will be the ultimate issues of all. However hidden a sin may be, one immediate result of it is inevitable: it deteriorates the character; it eats away the substance of manhood or womanhood, and makes the good

we might do impossible. And ultimately everything will be exposed; the judgment-seat of God has to be faced by every mortal; and every sin unconfessed and unforgiven will there fall under the immeasurable retribution of eternity.

JAMES STALKER.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE LAST VERSES OF MARK.

1. BY PROFESSOR TH. ZAHN.
2. BY DR. A. RESCH.

THE following article contains a translation, made at the request of the Editor, of the criticisms passed by two distinguished German scholars, Dr. A. Resch, and Professor Theodor Zahn, upon an article which appeared in this journal in October, 1893, entitled: "Aristion, the Author of the Last Twelve Verses of Mark." Professor Zahn is well known for his history of the canon, and for many other solid contributions to our knowledge of early Christian literature. His judgments have therefore a peculiar weight in regard to such a problem. Dr. Resch has given his theory to the world in the form of an appendix to his recent volume, entitled: "Aussercanonische Paralleltex-te." Professor Harnack also contributed an article upon the significance of the notice in the *Etschmiadzin Evangeliar*, brought to light by me in the above-mentioned number of the EXPOSITOR, to the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* for November, 1893. In his notice Prof. Harnack inclines to the view that the last twelve verses are due to Aristion, and that the Armenian notice discovered is to be taken in that sense. I have refrained from quoting his article at length, because it is little more than a recapitulation of my article in the EXPOSITOR. In the *Nuova Anthologia* also for January, 1894, there appeared a learned and sympathetic criticism of the matter, entitled: "Una Nuova Scoperta Biblica," from the pen of Professor Chiapelli, of the University of Naples. I have, however, confined myself to the two criticisms of Prof. Zahn and of Dr. Resch, because of the interesting hypotheses which they both of them raise in conjunction with my discovery, and of the very different conclusions which they derive from it. In a subsequent article I hope I may

be allowed to supplement my first article with more information with respect to the end of Mark which I have gathered from a careful inspection of the oldest manuscripts of the Gospels preserved in Venice, in London, and in Oxford. I shall at the same time offer some criticisms of the positions advanced in the two criticisms herewith translated.

FRED. C. CONYBEARE.

ARTICLE OF PROF. TH. ZAHN, of Erlangen, Translated from the *Theologische Literaturblatt*, of Leipzig, for 22 December, 1893: "Aristion, the Author of the Last Twelve Verses of Mark."

Under this title Mr. F. C. Conybeare, of Oxford, has published a small but important discovery which he has made, in the October number of the *EXPOSITOR*, pp. 241-254. I venture to give a short account of it, accompanying it with some remarks of my own. The discovery was made in the *Evangeliarium* of Etschmiadzin. This is in a single volume, bound in beautiful panels of carved ivory and containing interesting paintings, concerning all of which we read in J. Strzygowski's learned monograph published two years back, (*Byzantische Denkmäler*, 1, Wien, 1891). The ivory diptych, which has been used as a binding for it, is, after careful comparison, reckoned by this authority on the history of art to be a masterpiece of Ravennese art of the first half of the sixth century, while the pictures bound in at the beginning and end of the volume are esteemed to be products of Syrian miniature painting of the same epoch. The text of the Armenian Gospel, however, was written in the year 438 of the Armenian era, that is to say (438 + 551) 989 years after Christ (not 986, as Conybeare states, p. 242; see Strzygowski, p. 19 *f.*, and under the corrigenda), and the writer of it was a certain John, who wrote it for a monk and Presbyter Stephanus, in the monastery of Noravank.¹ This evangeliar is quite the oldest hitherto known biblical manuscript which contains Mark xvi. 9-20; for all the others which contain this section belong to the time of the Crusades, or are even later (Martin, *Introd. partie prat.*, II. 330). Now there is, it seems, a second Armenian version of Mark xvi. 9-20, which is not included in the printed Bibles (Martin, pp. 326-329). It is to be desired that Mr. Conybeare, who has examined the manuscripts of Etschmiadzin on the spot, should

¹ = New monastery.

give us a full account of the relation of this text to the versions of the end of Mark which are already printed.

The Stephanus at whose commission the Etschmiadzin book was written declares in a notice which he appends that "this book is to be read in this church, for it is copied from authentic and old originals" (Strzygowski, p. 19). The supposition that the much older binding and the pictures, which come at the beginning and end of the Armenian text of the year 989, belonged to one of these authentic and old originals, is a very obvious one to make; and the circumstance that the pictures appear to have been painted in or near Edessa suggests the further conclusion, that the Armenian text also is ultimately derived from the same quarter; and this is most probable so far as regards the ending of Mark upon other grounds (compare my history of the Canon, II. 913-924 *f.*). The information given by Conybeare, p. 243, is important for the further study of this question also; it is the following: After Mark xvi., 8, a space of two lines is left blank. Then follows in the same hand, only written in red, "*Ariston Eritzou,*" *i.e.*, Ariston, the Presbyter's, and there then come, still by the same hand, the verses Mark xvi. 9-20. It needs no proving to show that the original writer of these two words meant to say that the following section has not, like that which precedes, Mark for its author, but a certain Presbyter Ariston. Supposing that there existed in those genuine and old originals, or if not in them, at any rate in the oldest Armenian MSS. of the Gospels, such a title as this sharply demarcating the addition from the rest of the book, we can understand two circumstances that are in any case remarkable:—Firstly, that in so many Armenian MSS. up to quite modern times the addition is entirely absent; and secondly, that where it is given, it is regularly separated from the Gospel by a formal subscription and a jagged line (Martin, p. 331). As yet we do not know whence is derived the tradition so shortly, yet so clearly expressed in the words: "Ariston the Presbyter's"; but we must bear in mind that the Syrians were wont to hand down similar notices in their Bibles through hundreds of years. The notice as to how the Philoxeniana arose is derived from the archetype itself, and in the recension of Thomas of Heraklea has been transmitted to us in all later copies along with the latter's own notice of the revision he had made. The same is true of the notices as to the translations of John viii. 1-11.

In the case before us the question is not who was the translator, but who was the author; for the fact of the translation being by Aristion could not be so shortly expressed. The *genetivus auctoris* here is rather to be classed with the "Matthæi, Marci" in the titles of the columns of the Syriac Curetonian.

Now who is this Ariston? Conybeare has quite rightly rejected the idea of Ariston of Pella. It is quite true that Moses of Chorene had plenty of fables to narrate about him (II. 60), and we could not avoid thinking of him, if Langlois (*Coll. of Arm. Hist.*, I. 391; II. 110, n. 3) were right in ascribing to Moses the statement that Ariston was secretary of the Bishop Mark, of Jerusalem, in the time of Hadrian.

If that were so, the completer of the Second Gospel must have been identified with the secretary of the Evangelist Mark, and also have received the name Ariston. Langlois, however, seems to me to have made a mistake. For Moses has in view an Ariston who was secretary of Adrian and was sent by him to Persia, cf. also Lauer's translation, p. 118. Ariston of Pella, who wrote his dialogue, "Jason and Papiscus," after 135, and perhaps a good deal later, cannot be the author of a section, which Tatian already read in his Mark at the latest in 170, and which Justin had already known, so it would seem, as early as 150, though perhaps not as an integral part of the Gospel of Mark. There remains no other but the Aristion who was one of Papias' authorities (Eus., *H.E.*, III. xxxix. 4, 6, 7, 14). The title of Presbyter is given to him quite rightly, for Papias in that passage terms the teachers from whom he directly learned "The Presbyters" (xxxix. 3, *παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*). He does indeed also remark that he had occasionally derived information from such as were only pupils of these Presbyters, but this does not refer to Aristion. For the latter, along with the Presbyter John, were just the very teachers to whom, according to Eusebius, he especially referred by name, and to whom he claims to have himself listened. It follows that they were both "disciples of the Lord," and, instead of being pupils of the Apostles, belonged in their double capacity of chief teachers of Papias and of "disciples of the Lord" to the circle of those whom Papias calls *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι*. Whether or not the author of the title which prefaces the end of Mark understood this title rightly, makes no difference. We also have no right to foist upon him the perverse and forced interpretations of Eusebius.

Nor does the slight difference in the form of the name tell against our identification of the Presbyter Ariston and of the Aristion mentioned in Papias. For, in the first place, according to Conybeare, p. 243, the Armenian translation of Eusebius renders Aristion as Ariston, and in the second place the failure to distinguish the names is often met with elsewhere (see *Pape* under Ἀρίστων, no. 1a, and under Ἀριστίων, no. 1d. Also the Ariston of *Const. Ap.*, VII. 46, p. 223, 21, must certainly be the Aristion of Papias).

Now this Aristion can certainly not be the author of Mark xvi. 9-20; for he was not a writer. Papias assures us that he had been, not a reader of the writings, but an ear-witness of (*αὐτήκοος*), therefore a listener to the oral information of Aristion and John (39, 7). We are thus at the outset precluded from making the distinction and contrast which Conybeare makes, between the *διηγήσεις* of Aristion, as if these were written narratives, and the oral *παραδόσεις* of John in 39, 14. The comparison of Luke i. 1 does not justify such a distinction; for we only know that Luke is referring to written narratives, because he speaks of their being composed (*ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν*). A comparison of 39, 14 with 39, 7 rather proves this, that Eusebius at one time regards the communications of Aristion and John as *παραδόσεις* of the same kind, and so applies that name to both in a passage where he is expressly dealing with heard, that is to say, oral information; while at another time he varies his expression, though without varying his sense, and puts them together as the *διηγήσεις* of Aristion and the *παραδόσεις* of John.

Now, as we have no reason for assuming that any one else besides Papias collected and jotted down narratives of Aristion's, it follows, supposing the tradition to be a true one, that we must here look to the work of Papias as the source of Mark xvi. 9-20. It was to this very work, namely, to the already quoted preface of Papias that the description of Aristion as a Presbyter directed us. Papias ascribed his traditions for the most part to his own instructors, of whom Aristion was one (39, 7); it is therefore quite conceivable that the name of Aristion, rather than that of Papias, was retained in the Armenian title, because we have here a narrative expressly attributed by Papias to Aristion.

This conclusion cannot indeed be true of the whole section Mark xvi. 9-20, for its contents are too heterogeneous to be all of

one origin; for the narrative contained in xvi. 9-13 and xvi. 19-20 cannot be referred to a single witness; no more do these verses correspond to the precise statement of Eusebius (*Ἀριστίωνος . . . τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου λόγων διηγήσεις*, 39, 14). In xvi. 9-13 the chief apparitions of the risen Christ are enumerated according to the accounts of Luke and John, but they are not related. Neither can the verses xvi. 19-20 be termed a narrative of the Ascension and of the missionary activity of the apostles. In fact, it is only to the portion xvi. 14-18, so different in style and so original (*Hist. of the Canon*, I. 913 f.), that the Armenian title as well as the description which Eusebius gives of the character of Aristion's narratives can be held to apply. But here the principle acts: *a potiori fit denominatio*. Nor can we suppose that the entire end of Mark stood in Papias in such a form as this; a work consisting of five books and in accordance with its title intended to be mainly an exposition of the sayings of the Lord, containing moreover, according to the preface of Papias and the testimony of Eusebius, many traditions never before written down, cannot have passed so summarily over the whole of the history of the apostles and over such materials as we have in John xx. and Luke xxiv., as do the passages Mark xvi. 9-13 and 19-20. The following is what really occurred:—Some one who wished to give a fitting ending to the Gospel, which had been left incomplete, used for the purpose, not only the Gospels of Luke and John, but also the work of Papias. Out of the latter he took the single narrative, Mark xvi. 14-18, which Papias had inserted as information derived from Aristion. This is confirmed in a surprising way by the fact which Conybeare communicates, that in a MS. of Rufinus belonging to the Bodleian the name Aristion is written against the margin of Eusebius, iii. 39, 9, that is to say, against a narrative which closely concerns Mark xvi. 18, and which indeed proves to be a proof of the fulfilment of the very promise made by Jesus therein. In such a case there can be no talk of accident.

We may assign as the date of the composition of the appendix to Mark the years 130-140, if we remember on the one hand that Papias in all probability wrote his work under the reign of Hadrian, 117-138, say about the year 125 (see *Hist. of the Canon*, I. 802-854); and if we bear in mind, on the other hand, that Tatian at the latest about 170 knew the end of Mark, while the heathen Celsus probably knew it, as well as Justin, as early as

about the year 150. Now it would be an extremely improbable assumption that the composer of the appendix to Mark should have actually named Aristion as his authority, either in a prefatory title or in a marginal notice. If he did, how can we explain the fact that the notice was lost and disappeared from the hundreds of copies in which that appendix has been transmitted to us, so that we had no trace of it, until the Etschmiadzin Gospel was discovered? A learned notice of the kind is quite out of keeping with the style of Mark xvi. 9-20. Has not the author of it moreover cited John and Luke in *vv.* 9-13? On the other hand, the whole matter is easily explained if we assume that a learned man of the fourth or fifth century, who was interested in the question of the origin of Mark xvi. 9-20, because he did not find the section in all copies, who also knew the work of Papias and found in it a *Diegesis* of Aristion's, essentially the same with Mark xvi. 14-18, availing himself of his information, entered on the margin of his copy of the Gospels the words Ἀριστιῶνος πρεσβυτέρου. This notice may then have gained currency over a small range and have made its way to Armenia among other places. I may recall the parallel of Apollinarius, to whom we owe Papias' description of the death of Judas.

Thus interpreted, Conybeare's discovery gives a final solution of another problem, which before could not be solved. The longer form of the text of Mark xvi. 14, which Hieronymus quotes, *C. Pelag.*, ii. 15, is certainly not to be regarded as no more than an amplification of the canonical text such as a foolish but honest copyist may have perpetrated. It is also very improbable that the very original text, which Hieronymus there cites, attained its canonical form in the course of the transmission of Mark xvi. 9-20. For our witnesses to the text are so old and so numerous that we could not fail to find some trace of the original text in some other quarter as well. We are therefore met here with a fact similar to that of the variants of the Cambridge MS., which have a more than textual significance, and as such have lately been learnedly treated of by F. Blass (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1894, pp. 86-119). I had already pointed out the probability, the sole probability indeed (*Hist. of the Canon*, II. 935-937), that the text quoted by Hieronymus¹ flowed from the same source,

¹ *Hier. c. Pelag.*, 2, 15 : "in quibusdam exemplaribus et maxime in Gr. codd. iuxta Marcum in fine eius euangelii scribitur : Postea quum accubuissent un-

from which also the composer of the end of Mark drew. Now we know what was this source. It is the work of Papias and ultimately the oral tradition of Aristion. Just as one scholar, struck by the essential identity of Mark xvi. 14-18, with a section of Papias contented himself with noting in the margin of his book the words Ἀριστίωνος πρεσβυτέρου; so another supplemented the canonical text from the narrative of Aristion as it lay more fully before him in Papias.

TH. ZAHN.

AUSSER-CANONISCHE PARALLELTEXTE ZU DEN EVANGELIEN, by Alfred Resch, x. Band, Heft 3, of v. Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*, p. 449.

I have already had occasion to refer to Burgon's work entitled: *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel according to S. Mark*, vindicated against recent critical objectors, and established by John W. Burgon, Oxford and London, 1871. This work is a volume in gross octavo of 323 pages, and as to it Lagarde regretted (*Mittheilungen*, I. 113) that a treatise, so full of charm because of the enthusiasm for the Church and for true science which pervades it, should not be independently known in Germany.

Burgon defends with the emphasis of conviction the genuineness of the canonical ending of Mark and its original inclusion in the second canonical Gospel. I too am, and always have been, persuaded of the remote and respectable antiquity of the section of the text comprised in Mc. xvi. 9-20, and my patristic studies have but confirmed me in my conviction.

Nevertheless, Burgon's conclusions as regards the criticism both of text and sources will not hold good. Respectable as is the antiquity of this section, yet it is certainly from another hand than that which penned as far as Mc. xvi. 8 and then abruptly ceased. It is not merely that the two oldest uncial codices, the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus (cp. Heft i. 19), in conjunction with many other weighty witnesses (cp. Tischendorf, *Ed. oct. crit. maj. N.T.*, p. 403-407) intimate to us that Mc. xvi. 9-20 did not originally belong to the Second Gospel; beside their testimony we have that of two

decim, apparuit eis Iesus, et exprobrauit incredulitatem et duritiam cordis eorum (quia his qui uiderunt eum resurgentem) non crediderunt. Et illi satisfaciebant dicentes: Sæculum istud iniquitatis et incredulitatis substantia (ed. Vat. sub satana) quæ non sinit per immundos spiritus ueram dei apprehendi uirtutem. Idecirco iam nunc reuela iustitiam tuam."

much more ancient witnesses, namely, the first and third evangelists themselves. Both of these clearly hint that the Mark from which they drew ended with the verse Mc. xvi. 8 (=Lc. xxiv. 8 = Matt. xxviii. 8).

From this point on, each of these supplies us with other kinds of information, of which the difference in character is so marked as to show at once that the determining influence on both of the Gospel of Mark is interrupted in Luke at ch. xxiv. 8, in Matthew at ch. xxviii. 8. The entire literary style of their concluding sections (Mt. xxviii. 9-20 and Lc. xxiv. 9-53) announces to us that they flow from sources which were hidden from the second evangelist and never opened by him. But more than this. A thoroughgoing analysis of the text of Mc. xvi. 9-20 in itself proves that this section did not originally belong to the Gospel of Mark, nor form any part thereof. Thus we have the testimony of all three evangelists declaring that in these verses some other writer than Mark addresses us.

Who then was it to whom we owe the end of Mark? The answer is near to hand: it was he who drew up and edited the first canon of the Gospels. But who was this editor of the earliest canonical collection of the Gospels?

Until now this question has been impenetrably obscure. Yet our age, so rich in important literary discoveries, has brought us in regard to our ending of Mark a discovery calculated to throw some light on the question.

Under the title: "Aristion, the author of the Last Twelve Verses of Mark," there was published by Conybeare in the *EXPOSITOR* (for October, 1893, pp. 241-254) a brief but weighty article, in which he announced to the theological world a discovery he had made in an Armenian manuscript of the Gospels, which bore upon the question before us.

It was this. In contrast with all the other Armenian versions of the Gospels, which agree in rejecting the end of Mark, an Armenian codex of the Gospel, written in the year 989, and found in the patriarchal library of Etschmiadzin, gives the section Mc. xvi. 9-20 in the same hand as the rest of the Gospel, yet leaving between Mc. xvi. 8 and 9 an interval of two lines, in which there are inserted in red letters the words:

"Ariston Eritzu (*Ἀρίστωνος πρεσβυτέρου*)."

These words, which beyond doubt rest on a very old tradition, and have been accur-

ately handed down by the copyists from century to century, occupy an entire line (the codex being written in double columns), and so form the title of the section Mc. xvi. 9-20. The addition in an age long prior to textual criticism in our sense, and indeed to any textual criticism at all, of this title: 'Αρίστωνος πρεσβυτέρου, yields us a twofold testimony, on the one hand of the fact that the canonical ending of Mark did not originally belong to the second Gospel, on the other of the authorship of the additional section attached at a very remote time to Mc. xvi. 8.

It is true that the brief character of the notice leaves the latter point somewhat obscure. If we take the name 'Αρίστων in the strict form in which it has been transmitted, no other person can be considered to be referred to thereby than *Ariston of Pella*. Yet the confusion of the names 'Αρίστων and 'Αριστίων was in antiquity very common, as may be proved from several sources. If we adopt the form 'Αριστίων, it is an obvious thing to follow the theory which Conybeare, at the suggestion of his friend Archer, has propounded,—that in the author of the end of Mark we should recognise the Aristion whom Papias mentions along with the Presbyter John as one of his teachers and masters in tradition.

The contents and character of the section Mc. xvi. 9-20 agree well enough with such an assumption. For this section is free from all affectation and from all legendary colouring, such as, for example, we meet with in the pseudo-Petrine Gospel. It is rather characterised by a compendious abruptness, such as shows that the author of it says less than he knows. And accordingly Zahn (*Theol. Literaturblatt*, 1893, No. 51) has in all essential respects assented; as also Harnack (*Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1893, No. 23), who thus expresses himself: "In my judgment the facts are of a kind as to render unsuitable here a discussion of the main question involved"—so refraining from dissent.

Nevertheless there are considerations which tell against the theory and which must be carefully weighed.

In the first place, in the appeal of Papias to his two authorities, John and Aristion, we have to do with oral traditions and not with written memoranda. But the title of the end of Mark, "'Αρίστωνος πρεσβυτέρου," found in the Armenian codex of the Gospels, proves by its very brevity that in it there is named not an authority in the way of oral tradition, but the actual writer and author of the section.

Secondly, it is extremely unlikely that Aristion, had he been the author of the ending of Mark, would not have communicated it to Papias; or that Papias, when he gives us the valuable information he had gathered from *παραδόσεις*, orally communicated to him concerning the origin and character of Mark's Gospel, should have remained silent as to the origin of the end of Mark, supposing he had derived from his authorities any information on the point.

Thirdly, in view of the fact that the first and third Evangelists used the Gospel of Mark in the shorter form only, which ends at ch. xvi. 8; and also of the fact that this its original form was kept in the two oldest codices and was not unknown in the Church for centuries,—in view of all this, it is unlikely that the Second Gospel should have been rounded off and completed as a literary whole by the addition of the existing canonical ending at any time earlier than that in which our Gospel-canon grew up. It is, however, impossible to relegate the formation of our fourfold Gospel canon to so remote an age as that of Aristion, when oral tradition (*παραδόσεις*) still had so great an influence and such a lofty significance.

On the other hand, there are sure signs that the canonical ending of Mark originated at the same time and along with the Gospel canon. On the basis of the exposition contained in Heft i. 30–47 we can demonstrate a conclusion which seems never to have been put forward by any school of critics concerned with the examination of the ending of Mark, just because the connection between the different families of the Gospel text, and the oldest form of the Gospel canon, had not yet been clearly shown. On page 36 of the introductory volume the following rule was established for the criticism of the N.T. text: "Agreement between the Greek codex D, the old Latin versions and the Syriac of Cureton gives us beyond a doubt the text of the Archetype, that is to say, of the oldest Gospel canon, which was formed about 140 A.D." Following this rule, we must allow that the end of Mark, which figures in the Codex Cantabr., in the Syriac version of Cureton 2, in seven Italæ MSS. (among these is the important Codex Colbertinus), and besides that is contained in the *Diatessaron* (about 160–170), which depends on these sources, belonged to and formed part of that oldest Gospel canon. This Gospel canon, with which already Justin was acquainted, though he did not use it exclusively, in a few decades and apart from the Syriac Church, asserted its

supremacy as the only one in use, and came to be recognised to the exclusion of all others. Through it the end of Mark won the same recognition, being expressly mentioned by Irenæus, and was widely diffused in the manuscripts.

Now if an Ariston was the author of the canonical end of Mark, then the same Ariston must also have been the redactor of the earliest Gospel canon. The same hand which arranged the Gospels together in a well articulated whole also appended to the Second Gospel the section Mc. xvi. 9-20 by way of rounding it off as a literary whole. This twofold, though at the bottom single, editorial activity cannot in any case be carried back as far as Aristion, who was a pupil of the disciples and the authority from which Papias drew his collection of oral παραδόσεις; and it therefore follows that the Armenian title, "Ariston Eritzu (*i.e.* 'Ἀρίστωνος πρεσβυτέρου), can refer, as Sanday has already conjectured, (cp. Conybeare, p. 243) to no other person than the well-known Ariston of Pella. With such an inference well agrees the time in which Ariston lived, the locality in which he worked, and his roll in the Church so far as we know ought of it.

For the period of Ariston's activity the year 135 is the *terminus a quo*, a limit also which best agrees with the appearance about the year 140 (cp. vol. i. 12) of the Gospel canon. The scene of Ariston's activity lay in the region east of the Jordan, where, after the destruction of Jerusalem, was the seat of the bishop of Jerusalem, and the focus of the most ancient and precious form of Judaic Christianity. Close by Pella were also the head-quarters of heretical Jewish Christianity. Comp. *Epiaph. Huer.*, xxx., 18, p. 142 A, in regard to the Ebionites: ἀπό τε τῆς Βατανέας καὶ πανεάδος τὸ πλείστον, Μωαβιτιδὸς τε καὶ Κωχαβῶν τῆς ἐν τῇ Βασιανίτιδι γῆ, ἐπέκεινα Ἀδραῶν. *Huer.*, xv. 1, p. 291 D: ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ ἐν Κωχάβῃ,¹ ἔνθα οἱ τῶν Ἐβιωναίων τε καὶ Ναζωραίων ρίζαι ἐνήρξαντο. *Euseb., Onom.*, p. 372, 9-13, ed. Lagarde: Χωβά, ἣ ἐστὶν ἐν ἀριστέρᾳ

¹ In this connection Nestle has called attention to the remarkable fact that the scribe of the Vatican manuscript, which has preserved to us the *Evangelium Hierosolymitanum*, Elias of Abud, was abbot in a "star-cloister" (כוכב 222), and remarks thereon: "Perhaps what we have of Christian Palestinian literature is connected with this oldest trans-Jordanic Jewish Christianity. Lagarde long ago pointed out the importance which attaches to these regions for the original history of the churches. Perhaps it was such a reflexion which led him to devote a portion of his dying powers on the edition of the *Evangelium Hierosolymitanum*."

Δαμασκοῦ. ἔστι δὲ καὶ χωρὰ, κώμη ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς μέρεσιν, ἐν ᾗ εἰσὶν Ἑβραῖοι οἱ εἰς Χριστὸν πιστεύσαντες Ἑβιωναῖοι καλούμενοι.

It was among the Ebionites and Nazareans settled in these regions that we can trace the earliest use of the first Gospel (comp. above, p. 2, 3). It is to Pella also that we must look, if we would seek it, for the birthplace of the first Gospel. For the Jerusalem traditions, which have been precipitated in the peculiar passages of the Gospel according to S. Matthew (Mt. xxvii. 3-10; xxvii. 52, 53, 62-66; xxviii. 2-4, 9-15), were transplanted when the community of Jerusalem emigrated as a colony to Pella (Eus., *H.E.*, i. 7). Towards the same locality, lastly, is our attention directed by the question of the origin of the oldest Gospel canon, which by setting in the forefront and at its head the εὐαγγέλιον of the Jewish Christians is stamped with its origin in the most characteristic way possible.

But Ariston's standing in the Church, no less than the time and place in which he lived, makes him a fitting person in whom to recognise the redactor of the first Gospel canon and at the same time the author of the end of Mark. The Armenian manuscript of the Gospels indicates the author of Me. xvi. 9-20 to have been a presbyter. That Ariston was not bishop of Pella one knows from the list of the bishops of Jerusalem, which Epiphanius (*Haer.*, lxvi. 20) has preserved to us. The first fifteen bishops, who were all Jewish Christians (*Eriph.*, p. 637 A: οὗτοι δὲ ἀπὸ περιτομῆς ἐπεσκόπευσαν τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ) bear names which have nothing in common with the name Ariston. Even if one be not disposed to accept this list as quite historical, it is yet certain that a name like that of Ariston, supposing he had been bishop of the Jerusalem colony at Pella, could not have fallen into oblivion. But if he was not a bishop, he was most likely to be a Presbyter in Pella; and if the bishops were Jews by birth, the Presbyters would be so likewise. That Ariston however was a Jewish Christian may be inferred with certainty from the information about him preserved to us, in spite of its meagreness. For in the dialogue between Jason and Papiscus, which he composed in Greek, the Jewish Christian Jason was put forward against the Alexandrine Jew Papisus as the champion of Christianity in general. (Comp. Orig. Praef. in *Librum c. Celsum.*) But the redactor of the oldest Gospel canon must have been a Jewish Christian, otherwise it would not be intelligible that the Judao-Christian εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον

should head this canon. The person who for the first time arranged together the Gospels in one whole beyond doubt set a higher value on the εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον than on all the other Gospels. All these considerations suit the Jewish Christian Presbyter, Ariston of Pella.

If this contemporary of Justin's was the originator of the Gospel canon, and if the establishment of that canon, which was an event of the greatest importance for the future development of the church, took place in Pella, then we can understand how it was that Justin, who was a native of the neighbouring Samaria, knew of it at so early a date, and that he who was doubtless converted from being a Nazarene to Christianity, and who retained all through life his affection for the primitive and venerable Jewish Christian faith, should have sanctioned by use, at so early a time, the newly created Gospel canon. The same facts would explain the circumstances that his pupil Tatian worked up this Gospel canon into his διὰ τεσσάρων for the use of the Syrian Church, and that in a few decades the recognition of the Gospel canon by the Church was full and final.

It may be, then, that Conybeare's discovery of this important notice in the Armenian manuscript of Etschmiadzin not only dissipates the darkness which hitherto enshrouded the canonical ending of Mark, but at the same time supplies us with an answer to the still more important question of who was the author of the canon of the Gospels.

A. RESCH.

SURVEY OF RECENT BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

INTRODUCTION.—*Place aux Dames*: the new series, *Studia Sinaitica*, issued by the Cambridge University Press, is led off by Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson, the former contributing as the first number of the series a *Catalogue of the Syriac MSS.* in the convent of S. Catharine on Mount Sinai, while the latter gives us as the second number *An Arabic Version of the Epistles of St. Paul to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians*, with part of the Epistle to the Ephesians from a ninth century MS. found in the same convent. The enterprise, scholarship and industry of these ladies are worthy of the amplest recognition. No ordinary familiarity with the Semitic languages and with ancient and

modern Greek would suffice for the work which they have accomplished. The industry of Mrs. Lewis as well as the wealth of the St. Catharine's library may be gathered from the fact that nearly 400 MSS. and fragments are here catalogued and briefly described in Greek and English. Of course a large proportion of these MSS. are of late date; gospels, psalteries and liturgies used by past generations of monks; but it is only by this thorough-going investigation and cataloguing that the treasures hidden in Eastern monasteries can be ascertained and used for the good of Christendom. Mrs. Gibson's work will be valued by all Arabic scholars and those who have not familiarity with the language will learn from the suggestions of her brief preface the uses to which they may put her publication. It is probably unnecessary to add that the resources and workmanship of the Cambridge University Press have never been better illustrated than in these issues.

To the same series (No. IV.) Dr. Eberhard Nestle contributes *A Tract of Plutarch on the advantage to be derived from one's enemies*, in a Syriac version, edited from a MS. also found in St. Catharine's. This text is published partly to increase the number of printed Syriac texts for the convenience of the philological student, partly to throw light on the manner in which Christian monks adapted for their own uses the ethical tracts of heathen writers. This publication will be acceptable both to the historical and to the linguistic inquirer.

Almost simultaneously have been issued two works which put into our hands the amplest materials for the study of textual criticism. These are the fourth edition of the late Dr. Scrivener's *Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, and the concluding part of Gregory's *Prolegomena* to Tischendorf's eighth edition of the Greek Testament. In the hands of the present editor, Mr. Edward Miller, the *Plain Introduction* of Dr. Scrivener has become an encyclopædia, gathering into itself the results arrived at by the most authoritative specialists. When it is understood that in this new edition the chapter on the Latin versions has been written by the Rev. H. J. White, under Dr. John Wordsworth's supervision, and with help from M. Samuel Berger; and that the chapters on the Syriac, Egyptian, Armenian, Arabic, Slavonic and Anglo-Saxon versions have either been written or revised by such scholars as Gwilliam, Deane, Headlam, Margoliouth, Bebb and Bright; and that in other departments

the aid of authoritative experts has been freely accorded, it will be seen that we have here a work which must for many years remain the standard book on textual criticism. Since 1861, when the first edition was published, it has grown to almost double the size, and to a great deal more than double the value. Even those who do not believe in Dr. Scrivener's principles of criticism—and they are, I think, a decreasing number—will readily acknowledge that his *Plain Introduction* is indispensable to the student.

But Gregory's *Prolegomena* to Tischendorf are also indispensable. The fulness and accuracy of treatment are astonishing. Dr. Gregory in dedicating his book to the theological faculty of Leipsic subjoins the words, "Peregrinus eram atque conlegistis me"; they have not merely shown him hospitality, but have inoculated him with their industry and methods. We have indeed in these *Prolegomena* a work in every respect worthy of the best German scholarship. Nothing seems to have escaped the knowledge of Dr. Gregory. On comparing his chapters on the versions with those contributed to Dr. Scrivener's work by our own specialists, one is astonished to find so much that is new and so many evidences of independent and successful research. The cataloguing of MSS. may be said to be the speciality of the book, but the bibliography and the explanatory introductions are also abundantly complete and suggestive. Every one who has watched the progress of Dr. Gregory's labours must cordially congratulate him on the completion of a work which is undoubtedly one of the noblest contributions to Biblical literature which modern scholarship has made.

Attention should be called to *A Harmony of the Gospels for Historical Study*, by Professors W. Arnold Stevens and Ernest de Witt Burton. It is published by Messrs. Silver, Burdett & Co., of Boston, and is issued in a very attractive and serviceable form. The authors have made a very careful study of the Gospels, and their harmony is, in my opinion, the best before the public. The text used is that of the Revised Version.

Among books on introduction may be included Prof. George Adam Smith's *Historical Geography of the Holy Land* (Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton). At once this has been accepted as a standard work. Its animated and lucid style will ensure its being widely read, and wherever it is read it will be with satisfaction. "Students of the Bible desire to see a background and to feel an

atmosphere; to discover from the 'lie of the land' why the history took certain lines, and the prophecy and Gospel were expressed in certain styles; to learn what geography has to contribute to questions of Biblical criticism; above all, to discern between what physical nature contributed to the religious development of Israel, and what was the product of purely moral and spiritual forces." It has been the aim of Prof. Smith to supply this important aid to Biblical study, and this aim he has abundantly succeeded in attaining. Throughout, but especially in the earlier chapters, the book is full of suggestiveness, and sudden light is continually being flashed upon the language of the prophets, and a new significance imparted to the historical statements of the Bible. It is safe to say that without Prof. Smith's volume no one should suppose that he understands the Old Testament. The student might possibly find in other authorities as much geographical detail and as many safe identifications of localities mentioned in Scripture, but he will nowhere else be so effectually introduced to the genius of the land, or see so clearly how its features influenced its fortunes, its history and its literature. A book containing so much knowledge and so much thought as this would have been a creditable life-work for ordinary men; to Dr. Smith's industry it is but a parergon.

EXPOSITION.—In exposition we have the twenty-second and twenty-third volumes of Dr. Joseph Parker's *People's Bible*. These contain a complete commentary on the Book of *Acts*; and although, as he warns us, a large part of the matter has already appeared in his *Apostolic Life*, there is addition and revisal, and it is well to have the old material in this form. Dr. Nicoll is to be congratulated on his happy choice of Prof. Bennett as the expositor of *The Books of Chronicles* ("The Expositor's Bible," Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton). In the hands of the average commentator these books would have fared ill; Prof. Bennett has, without exaggeration, given them a new lease of life. He has taught us what to find in them and how to read them. An expert in Old Testament criticism, he deals frankly with their origin, date, and object; but in letting in upon them the light of the most scientific scholarship he gives us a new appreciation of their value. Using the liberty accorded to writers in this series, he has divided his work into four parts: a critical but popularly written Introduction; a most suggestive discussion of the chronicler's method, the significance

of names, statistics, genealogies and so forth; then, an exposition of the Messianic and other types, such as David, Solomon, the Priests, the Prophets, Satan; and lastly a commentary on the history from 2 Chronicles x. to the end. He is equally happy whether he is seeking to give his reader a hold on the work as a whole, or in guiding him to principles of interpretation, or in explaining and commenting on details. His illustrative matter is drawn from wide and varied reading and is always apt and enlightening. Prof. Bennett's book is probably the best specimen we have of the application of the higher criticism, and it will go far to justify its methods to the popular mind. No reader can peruse what Prof. Bennett has written without perceiving how much is gained for edification and reverence for the Bible by accepting the results of a sound criticism. All who wish to understand the Bible should read this volume; they will find it not only an instructive and edifying but a delightful employment.

In *The Resurrection of the Dead*, by the late William Milligan, D.D. (Messrs. T. & T. Clark), we have a reprint of several articles on 1 Corinthians xv., some of which appeared in this Magazine. They will be remembered as excellent specimens of scholarly and devout exposition, and they form a safe guide through a difficult passage of Scripture. Prof. Milligan was a theologian as well as a scholar, and there is always a substance or body in his work which one sometimes misses elsewhere.

MISCELLANEOUS.—The debt which the theological student already owes to Prof. Swete has been materially increased by his learned, timely and important reply to Prof. Harnack on *The Apostles' Creed* (Cambridge University Press). The Berlin scholar about two years ago published a pamphlet which Mrs. Humphry Ward considered worthy of being introduced to the English public through the pages of the *Nineteenth Century* for July, 1893. The pamphlet very naturally produced a stir among German theologians which has not yet died down. It was indeed alarming to hear from so competent a master of early church history that some statements of the Apostles' Creed are in excess of Apostolic teaching, and that others have been and are interpreted as they were not meant to be by the framers of the Creed. Prof. Swete submits Prof. Harnack's conclusion to a detailed examination, and by the simple, instructive, and conclusive method of citing passages from early writers thoroughly demolishes his position and re-

instates the Creed in the esteem of Christendom. The book is a small one, scarcely 100 pages, but it is eminently worthy of study. Its fulness of knowledge and exact theological statement make it worthy of the attention not only of those "educated members of the English Church" for whom especially it has been prepared, but of all who like to see ignorant misrepresentation confronted by truth.

M. Paul Sabatier's *Life of St. Francis of Assisi* was reviewed in these pages when it first appeared, and already it has found so firm a place in public favour that now it only needs to be said that a translation by Louise Seymour Houghton has been published by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton. It was inevitable that so singularly impressive a book should be translated: it was not inevitable it should fall into the hands of so entirely satisfactory a translator. To say that the translation is worthy of the book is to give it the highest commendation, and this it has fairly earned. The English edition is issued in an extremely attractive form, the printing and binding being all that can be desired. The book itself is a permanent addition to the best class of literature. Years of arduous preparation have been freely given to make the book worthy of its subject. M. Sabatier has steeped his mind in the literature of the thirteenth century, and has spent much time in the localities associated with St. Francis that the *genius loci* might give the right colour to his work; he is at once profoundly sympathetic with the religious enthusiasm of St. Francis and scientifically critical of the biographical and documentary sources, and he has produced what must be accepted as the truest picture of one of the most sincere and original of men.

There was certainly room for such *A History of the Christian Church during the first six centuries* as Archdeacon Cheetham has given us (Messrs. Macmillan & Co.). It ranges with Bishop Westcott's *Introduction to the Gospels*, and is intended to furnish "a convenient summary for those who can give but little time to the study, and also to serve as a guide for those who desire to make themselves acquainted with the principal documents from which the history is drawn." Both these aims are fulfilled. As was to be expected from so competent a scholar, the summary is accurate, full, and significant; the bibliography, although by no means complete, as indeed was not to be desired, is sufficient and well-judged. As an introduction to the study of Church history it will admirably serve its purpose.

None like it: a plea for the old sword, by Joseph Parker, author of *Ecce Deus* (James Nisbet & Co.) is a defence of the inspiration and authority of the Bible. No one can doubt the extreme cleverness of this polemic, nor indeed its effectiveness in some passages, but as a whole it is not a satisfactory treatment of the question. "Immensely entertaining, but not sufficiently thorough," will be the verdict of most readers; some may say "obstinately, perversely reactionary."—No argument from history can justify the existence of the Episcopate so thoroughly as the conscientious and salutary supervision of the Church which is disclosed in the Bishop of Manchester's published Charges. Bishop Moorhouse has taught us to expect knowledge, intelligence, sense and breadth of view in all he writes. The addresses which he gave during a recent visitation of his diocese, and which he publishes (Messrs. Macmillan and Co.) under the title of *Church Work, its means and methods*, possess these qualities in a high degree. Almost every department of Church work is touched upon, and always with sobriety and insight. The actual condition and the true needs of the people are brought clearly into view, and clergymen of every denomination will derive benefit from the consideration of the methods advocated by Bishop Moorhouse.—The Rev. D. J. Vaughan, Canon of Peterborough, has published, through Messrs. Macmillan & Co., several addresses on *Questions of the Day*, which he delivered in St. Martin's, Leicester, between the years 1870 and 1890. The difficult problems of War, Capital and Labour, Co-operation, Disestablishment and such like are handled with frankness, and decision, and generally with wisdom. Sometimes, however, as in the address on "Religious Equality," too much is taken for granted, and his argument does not touch the stronghold of those who occupy an antagonistic position.—Mr. David Nutt publishes an interesting volume on *Scarabs* by Isaac Myer, LL.B., member of the American Oriental Society and of other Historical, Oriental, and Numismatic Societies. In his present work Mr. Myer gathers together everything which can illustrate the manufacture, history, and religious symbolism of the Scarabaeus in Egypt and other countries. The oldest Scarabs bear the name of a Pharaoh who is believed to have reigned four thousand years before the Christian era. That they were used as symbols of resurrection and immortality appears to have been placed beyond doubt. Mr. Myer's investigations into this somewhat odd and quaint symbolism bring out some interest-

ing and important features of the ancient Egyptian religion, and as a contribution to the history of the idea of resurrection the testimony of the Scarab cannot be overlooked.—Principal Cave has gathered into a volume, which he names *The Spiritual World*, eleven Lectures which he has delivered partly at Mansfield Summer School, partly as the “Ancient Merchant’s Lectures.” The former course of lectures is interesting and valuable. Principal Cave seeks to demonstrate the dependence of theology upon philosophy. For theology two things are requisite: facts to study and a faculty to know them. According to the lecturer we have both. But although he certainly makes out that we have a perception or knowledge of a spiritual world, he can scarcely be said to demonstrate that we have *such* knowledge of it as suffices for the foundation of a scientific theology. As against Ritschlianism however the lectures are conclusive, and points of vital importance to theology are discussed. The second course of lectures contains much that preachers and private Christians will find helpful.

Dr. H. Clay Trumbull, of Philadelphia, is already favourably known to Biblical students as the author of “*Kadesh-Barnea*” and “*The Blood Covenant*.” He now issues in a most sumptuous form a volume which will attract a larger number of readers, and which is not less distinguished by evidences of personal observation and research than his former publications. His new work is entitled *Studies in Oriental Social Life; and Gleams from the East on the Sacred Page*, and is published by Messrs. John D. Wattles and Co., of Philadelphia. It is not a mere narrative of personal travel and observation, nor is it a miscellaneous collection of Oriental illustrations of Bible truths. “It is a classified treatment of certain phases of Oriental life and methods of thought, vivified by personal experiences in the East.” It successfully blends what is helpful to the Biblical student with what is entertaining. The book can be read with interest from beginning to end, and by the help of its complete indexes it can be consulted on any particular text or topic. Few, if any, books on the subject will prove so attractive to young people; and although there are statements which will provoke the criticism of anthropologists, Dr. Trumbull has taken up his position with deliberation.

To their “Christian Classics” Messrs Samuel Bagster & Sons have added neat and handy reprints of those immortal books, George Herbert’s *Poems* and Jeremy Taylor’s *Holy Living*.—From

Berbice comes a volume of short, fervent sermons by the Rev. L. Crookall, published by Elliot Stock, and entitled *Topics in the Tropics; or, Short Studies in the Life of Christ*.—Also from British Guiana comes a powerful series of addresses, *From Religion to Revelation*, by W. B. Ritchie, M.A., Georgetown. These are decidedly fresh, able, and helpful apologetic discourses. (J. Thomson, Demerara).—Mr. Orpen-Palmer publishes (Elliot Stock) separately his drama *Jezebel*, which previously was issued with his book on the Seven Churches.—In *Discipleship: the scheme of Christianity*, the author of “*The King and the Kingdom*” (Williams and Norgate) gives a more succinct statement of the views he promulgated in his former and larger book. With many of the writer’s statements one must disagree, but he is in earnest and sometimes suggestive. It is a gratifying sign of the times that so many thoughtful men are striving for themselves to find what Jesus really meant and intended.—Mr. Henry Smith, of Cravensea, Torquay, publishes through Mr. Elliot Stock an argument addressed to an Agnostic, entitled *The Practical Value of Religious Belief*.—*The Controversy of Zion* is a collection of papers by the late Dr. Christie, edited by T. Williamson and published by Mr. Edward Howell, of Liverpool. There is enough good sense and vigorous expression in these papers to have made an excellent small volume, but by publishing too much the editor or literary executor has hidden what is really good.

“This book,” says Lord Harrowby, “ought to be in the hands of those who care for religion throughout the country. . . . I entreat everybody who has influence to buy and to circulate this little book.” The “excellent little book” is a reprint from the *Churchman* of Archdeacon Sinclair’s article, *The Prospects of the Principles of the Reformation in the Church of England*. It fully deserves the recommendation of Lord Harrowby. More technical and very learned is the Ven. Archdeacon’s charge on *The English Church and the Canon Law*, published also by Mr. Elliot Stock. This is a most serviceable pamphlet, showing what the Canon Law actually is, and what is its place in English Ecclesiastical Law.

MARCUS DODS.

PROFESSOR W. ROBERTSON SMITH'S DOCTRINE
OF SCRIPTURE.

I HAVE been asked to describe what I believe to be the late Prof. Robertson Smith's doctrine of Holy Scripture as distinguished from the common Broad Church doctrine on the one hand, and from what may be called the Princeton view on the other. The materials for this statement are to be found in his various defences made before the Presbytery of Aberdeen and before the General Assembly in his famous trial, and in his opening lecture, *What History Teaches us to Seek in the Bible*, and I shall try to give it in Prof. Smith's own words. Prof. Robertson Smith invariably based his doctrine of Scripture on what he held to be the fundamental difference between the reformation idea of Scripture and that maintained in the mediæval Church, and in order to get at his point of view, it is necessary to see in what that difference consisted. For Prof. Robertson Smith declared over and over again that he stood on the same ground and maintained the same doctrine of Scripture which was held by Calvin and by all the leading reformers, and which is contained in all the principal confessions of the Reformation period.

It is too often forgotten that the mediæval Church did not, as a rule, warn its people against reading the Bible; that translations of the Vulgate were repeatedly made into the languages of Europe for the benefit of the common people; that mediæval theologians unanimously declared that their theology was based upon Scripture; and that at the beginning of the Reformation controversy Luther and

his friends never for a moment believed that their appeal to the Scriptures as the ultimate judge in controversies about religious topics would be refused. Indeed, so confident were the Lutherans in the matter that the earlier Lutheran symbols do not contain any statements of the supreme authority of Scripture as a distinctive article of the Protestant creed.

It is interesting to note that Luther makes his appeal to Scripture with the same unconscious serenity that no one can gainsay him, as he had when he set the believer's spiritual experience of the fact that he (the believer) was saved from sin by the merits of Christ against the proposal to sell God's pardon for money. Nor did his opponents gainsay him. They believed that they were able to meet Scripture with Scripture. They were content to abide by his challenge, and were sure that Scripture would decide against the Reformer.

It soon became apparent, however, that Luther had a much firmer grasp of Scripture than they had, and this meant much more than that he had a better memory for texts than his opponents. It meant that he had, somehow or other, an idea of Scripture which they had not. Their appeal to Scripture was "a balancing of texts or interpretation of texts, in which everything seemed in an uncertain flux unless backed by the authority of the Fathers or of the Church."¹ Luther had an idea of the *unity* of Scripture which they had not, and they soon felt that if they were to meet him on equal terms, they must also put a unity into Scripture in a manner previously unknown in the mediæval Church. Hence the famous decree of the Council of Trent, which, nominally, placed *traditiones sine scripto* on the same level with canonical Scripture, but which, really, gave an artificial unity to Scripture by means of a uniform ecclesiastical tradition, and for the first time stated ex-

¹ *What History Teaches us to Seek in the Bible*, p. 6.

plicitly what had been perhaps unconsciously held all down mediæval history.

This leads me to ask what the mediæval doctrine of Scripture was, and why it required to be supplemented in this fashion. Mediæval theology always regarded the Bible as a book full of divine information or infallible truths about doctrines and morals. This idea carries with it the great difficulty that such a description does not seem to apply to a great part of Scripture. The Bible contains long lists of genealogies, chapters containing little else than descriptions of temple furniture, details of simple family life and of national history. The mediæval theologian had therefore either to cut out all this irrelevant matter, or to change these inventories and simple histories into doctrinal propositions or moral rules. He chose the latter alternative, and declared that the Bible had other meanings than the ordinary sense of the words disclosed. It had a fourfold sense, and these various senses were used to deduce theological doctrine from the genealogies of Abraham and David, and rules of conduct from descriptions of the high priest's robes or from the narrative of our Lord's journey from Capernaum to Nain.

It is sometimes difficult to know what is the precise meaning of certain passages of the Bible, even where the reader thinks only of the plain historical meaning; but the difficulty must be greatly enhanced if each passage may have four senses; and while mediæval theology made it almost hopeless, by its theory of a fourfold sense, to know precisely what the Bible did teach, their doctrine of faith made it imperative that every Christian should have this exact information. The mediæval theologian declared that saving faith was assent to correct propositions about God, the universe, and the soul of man contained in the Bible. He was therefore compelled to have recourse to a *regula fidei* or to a *traditio apostolica et ecclesiastica* which was

outside Scripture, and which would guide him safely in striving to puzzle out the meaning of its statements. The incurable vice of the mediæval doctrine of Scripture may therefore be briefly stated to be : It started with the theory that the Bible is nothing but a compendium of *fragmentary* intellectual truths about doctrines and morals, and that saving faith is the assent to these truths ; it had to invent the idea of a fourfold sense in Scripture to make its theory fit the facts of the case ; and, having thus destroyed the inherent and historical unity of the Bible in favour of a vicious intellectualism, it was compelled to manufacture a fictitious and external unity of Scripture by means of a theory of an ecclesiastical tradition or uniform traditional method of interpreting the meaning of texts.

This was the doctrine of Scripture which the Reformers were confronted with, and which from the beginning they opposed, guided at first perhaps by unconscious religious premonition rather than by clear dogmatic vision. At all events, the beginnings of the Reformation doctrine of Scripture spring from religious experience, and belong to the experimental rather than to the dogmatic side of Christian theology. For the Reformation doctrine of Scripture is just as much based on a fact of the religious experience of the Christian man as is its doctrine of justification by faith.

When Luther, Zwingli, or Calvin studied the Bible, they found in it what had been doubtless discovered by thousands of pious souls before their day, but what had never found its way into the dogmatic definitions of theologians—that in this Scripture they had fellowship and communion with God their Father. This was the experimental fact which lay at the basis of what afterwards grew to be the Reformation doctrine of Scripture, and it so changed the whole aspect of matters that it is scarcely too much to say that it meant that the Bible was discovered by the Reformers as Columbus discovered America. Of course, the Reformers

found in the Bible the doctrines of the Christian religion and rules to guide them in all holy living, but they found besides what was worth a hundredfold more—personal fellowship with a redeeming God.

The two thoughts of faith and Scripture correspond with each other. In mediæval theology they are both above all intellectual and propositional; to the Reformer they are both above all experimental and personal. To the mediæval theologian faith is primarily assent to propositions, it rests on propositions, it can hardly get beyond exact definitions of intellectual and ethical abstract truths, and the Bible contains these propositions; to the Reformer faith is primarily trust in a Person, it rests on a Person, it must have personal fellowship or its springs dry up, and the Bible gives it that blessed communion. These descriptions of faith and Scripture were no mere theological statements to the Reformers. They portrayed what they had experienced, the deepest facts in their religious life which made them live as Christian men; but they form the basis of their doctrine of Scripture, which can never be separated from their doctrine of saving faith. It was the sense of these experimental facts deeply rooted in their own hearts which gave the Reformers strength to use the Bible as it had never been used before.

It is interesting to notice that as the mediæval Church separated itself more and more from the idea that fellowship with a personal Saviour could be had in the Scriptures, pious Christians seemed forced to seek for it elsewhere. They had to get into personal touch with Jesus Christ somehow. They were taught that what they were to seek in the Bible was not the personal Jesus, but doctrines about Him, and they turned almost feverishly to find this fellowship in a contact with the corporeal presence in the Sacrament of the Altar. The eagerness with which such a doctrine as Transubstantiation was welcomed can only be explained on

the ground that it seemed to be the *only* way in which a believer could come into *actual contact* with the Saviour. For the deepest Christian life is the same in all ages—it must be one of fellowship with Jesus. Touching Christ is the test of genuine catholicity. The Reformers found this living fellowship in the Bible. They saw that the Word of God was a deeply personal thing, and that God Himself was behind every part of it—not an abstract Truth but a personal Father. “On the one side, on the divine, there is God pouring out His whole heart, revealing the inmost treasures of His righteousness and love in Christ the incarnate Word; on the other side, on the human, there is the believing soul looking straight through all works, and all symbols, and all words to Christ Himself, and united to Him by faith in the closest *personal* union.”¹ To the Reformers, therefore, the chief end of Revelation is to bring God near *me*—to unite two personalities in loving and adoring fellowship. Revelation is the direct message of God’s love to me; not doctrine, but promise; not display of God’s thoughts, but of Himself as my God and my Father. The Reformers found in Scripture a divine fellowship as close and as intimate as the mediæval Christian was supposed to get by his theory of Transubstantiation. The words of Scripture were the revelation of the heart of God, and words are the best means of such a revelation. Luther rings the changes on this. Works will reveal God; symbols may have their divine significance; but words excel all other means of communion. A brute, he says, can do works and show what is in it thereby; but a man speaks out what his heart thinks. We are therefore to go to the Bible feeling that we are having speech with God, and that the speech declares God’s heart. “Let no pious Christian, therefore,” says Luther, “stumble at the simple word and story that meet him so often in Scripture.” These can

¹ *What History Teaches us to Seek in the Bible*, p. 22.

never be mere dead histories of what has once happened and concern men no more, unless bidden meanings are put into them by an allegorical sense. They tell how God dealt with men long ago, and how He will deal with us now. No detail of individual or national life is useless. Everything helps to fill in the picture of fellowship between God and His people which was in the past, and which can come true in our own experience if we have the same faith which these holy men of old had.

When the Reformers regarded the Bible as the means of fellowship with a personal God, who down through the ages had spoken to His people, telling His salvation, and giving the promise of it, sometimes in direct words, sometimes in pictures of His dealing with a chosen people or a favoured individual, it is scarcely necessary to say that they were compelled to look at it as a history. Personality and personal fellowship move in the plane of history and rest in that of metaphysics. The other side of the thought that in and through the Bible we have fellowship with a personal God, and not merely fragmentary collections of abstract truths, is that Scripture is in the main historical, and admits of historical treatment. Or, as Prof. Robertson Smith put it, "Just as the principle of personal faith is the foundation of all the fresh life of the Reformation, so the principle of a historical treatment of Scripture is at bottom the principle of the whole Reformation theology."

But if it be said that the Scriptures are historical records and describe the historical origins of our religion, which admit of historical treatment, and are to be tested by the ordinary methods of historical evidence, this is only a half truth. "The Bible story contains something that rises above the analogy of ordinary history, and so cannot be gauged or tested by any historical evidence. In it we see God drawing near to man, revealing to us His redeeming love, choosing a people for Himself, and declaring to them

His mind and will. To apprehend this supernatural reality, to grasp it as a thing real to us, which is to enter into our lives and change our whole natures, we need a new spiritual gift. No personal truth coming to us from without can be apprehended, except by a power *within*, putting us into communion with it; but fallen man has no natural power of communion with God; and so only the Spirit of God in the heart of the believer enables him to realize that in very truth it is God, and none else, that is seen in the history, and speaks in the Word revealing Himself and declaring His will. This is the doctrine of the witness of the Spirit as taught by Paul in 1 Corinthians ii. 11: "What man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him? *Even so the things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God.*"¹

There are then two sides to the Biblical records: on the one hand, they are historical documents, subject to the ordinary career of historical research; and on the other hand, they are the medium whereby the personal God reveals Himself to His people. On the one side there are a whole variety of elements which are common to the Bible with all other historical records, such as, when the various books were written, or by whom they were written, or how often they were changed, re-edited, or added to before the record of revelation was finally completed, or in what literary form they were cast, or what modes of literary handling they display, or what their literary merits and demerits may be judged to be—all of which are subject to ordinary historical treatment. These are to be treated by the ordinary methods of historical evidence, are but methods of Divine faith depending on the special action of the Spirit in our hearts; and conclusion regarding them may be come to by a due use of natural means on the part of any candid thinker. On the other hand, through these records and

¹ *Answer to the Form of Libel*, p. 22.

what they contain, believers have a personal fellowship with God, and reach that knowledge of God and of His will which is necessary to salvation—and this knowledge cannot submit to any ordinary test or standard of human knowledge, but is witnessed to by the Spirit of God.

Before trying to show how Professor Robertson Smith, following carefully in the footsteps of the Reformers, combined these two sides into one whole of doctrine of Scripture, let me say that all the Reformers, because they held firmly by the doctrine of the witness of the Spirit, could treat the record of Scripture with what to many would now seem inexcusable boldness. No special theories of inspiration, no preconceived notions of what authoritativeness and infallibility *must* imply, stayed Calvin's critical labours. He confessed, without attempting to explain, or without thinking it necessary to explain, the presence of discrepancies, and even errors, in a guarded sense of that word, in the record of Scripture.

Thus, in his commentary on Matthew xxvii. 9, he says: "Quo modo Hieremiæ nomen obrepserit, me nescire fateor, nec anxie laboro, certe Hieremiæ nomen *errore* positum esse pro Zacharia, res ipsa ostendit." And on Acts vii. 16, he declares that Luke may have got the fact that the other patriarchs, as well as Joseph, were taken to Palestine to be buried from an old tradition current among the Jews; he says, "in nomine Abrahamæ *erratum palam esse*"; and he adds without a word of explanation, "Quare hic locus corrigendus est."

It is needless to multiply instances. It is plain enough that Calvin would have fared badly at the presbytery of Cincinnati or before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America.

What then was the doctrine of Scripture which enabled Calvin, on the one hand, to be contemptuous ("nec anxie laboro") about small discrepancies in the Biblical records,

and at the same time to say, "This is the principle which distinguishes our religion from all others, that we know that God hath *spoken* to us, and are assuredly persuaded that the prophets spoke not their own sense, but as they were organs of the Holy Spirit, uttered only what was given them from heaven. . . . The same Spirit which assured Moses and the prophets of their vocation now also beareth witness in our hearts that He *used their ministry* in order to teach us,"¹ or which enabled Prof. Robertson Smith to say that "the memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah, the colourless narrative of the Chronicles, and even the Book of Esther, are singularly destitute of literary merit," or that "the brief revival of spoken prophecy after the exile lacks the old fire, and presents no notable literary feature except the use of somewhat fantastic symbolic imagery, the prototype of the later apocalyptic literature"; and to declare, "If I am asked why I receive Scripture as the Word of God, and as the only perfect rule of faith and life, I answer with all the fathers of the Protestant Church, *Because the Bible is the only record of the redeeming love of God, because in the Bible alone I find God drawing near to man in Jesus Christ, and declaring to us in Him His will for our salvation. And this record I know to be true by the witness of His Spirit in my heart, whereby I am assured that none other than God Himself is able to speak such words to my soul?*"²

The doctrine may be stated under four heads: 1. There is a distinction to be drawn between the Word of God and those Scriptures in which that Word was afterwards recorded, or, to put it otherwise, we must distinguish between the record and the divine communication of God's heart and will which the record conveys. This distinction is conspicuous in the reformed confessions. Thus the ancient French Confession says (Art. II.): "This God manifests

¹ *Comm. on 2 Tim.* iii. 16.

² *Answer to the Form of Libel*, p. 21; cf. also speech in Assembly of 1878.

Himself as such to men, first, by His works . . . ; secondly, and more clearly, by His word, which, originally revealed by oracle, was *thereafter* reduced to writing in the books which we call Holy Scriptures. The Dutch Confession, revised at the Synod of Dort (Artt. II., III.) says: “Secondly, He manifested Himself more clearly and perfectly in His holy and Divine Word, to wit, as far as is necessary for us in this life to His glory, and the salvation of His own. This Word of God was not sent forth by man’s will, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. . . . *Thereafter*, by a special care which He hath for us and our salvation, God commanded His servants, the Prophets and Apostles, to put His revealed Word in writing.” The Westminster Confession (Ch. I.) makes the distinction even more emphatic—“Therefore it pleased the Lord at sundry times and in divers manners to reveal Himself, and to declare that His will (*i.e.*, that knowledge of God and of His will which is necessary unto salvation) unto His Church; and *afterwards* . . . to commit the same wholly unto writing, which maketh the Holy Scripture to be most necessary; those former ways of God’s revealing His will unto His people being now ceased.” Calvin describes the Word of God, used in this sense, to be “spiritual doctrine, the gate, as it were, whereby we enter into His heavenly kingdom”;¹ or, again, as “a mirror in which faith beholds God.”² Professor Robertson Smith, condensing the statements of many Protestant confessions, declares that the Word of God “consists of God’s commands, threatenings, and promises, addressed to our faith, and, above all, of the gospel offer of Christ to us”;³ and in another passage,⁴ he adds, “the Word of God is nothing else than the personal manifestation to us for salvation of God and His will. God’s word

¹ Genevan Catechism.² *Nest. Lib.*, III., Ch. 2, Sec. 6.³ *Answer to Form of Libel*, p. 26.⁴ p. 25.

is the declaration of what is in God's heart with regard to us. The Scripture, therefore, in the strictest sense, is not this Word of God, but the record which conveys it to us.

But it must not be supposed that this word of God is a series of hortatory discourses only; that would be to fall back into the mediæval error. The declaration of God's will, recorded for us in the Scripture, took place in a historical process. God showed Himself to His ancient people in a long miraculous history, coming to its fullest and highest in the incarnation and historical work of Christ, and therefore the record of revelation was so framed as to include everything necessary to enable us to understand the declaration of God's will in its historical context and in its historical manifestation.¹ Abraham's history is precious to us, says Luther, "because it is filled so full of God's Word with which all that befell him is so adorned and made fair, and because God everywhere goes before him with His Word, promising, commanding, comforting, warning, that we may verily see that Abraham was God's special trusty friend. Let us mirror ourselves, then, on this holy father Abraham, who walks not in gold and velvet, but girded, crowned, and clothed with divine light, that is, with God's Word." The simplest Bible stories, and even geographical and architectural descriptions, may, and do, give us the side-lights necessary to complete the manifestation of God to His people.

2. We must be careful, however, not to use this true distinction between the Word of God, and Scripture which is its record, in a wrong sense, as has been frequently done. Mystical theologians, basing their ideas on the supreme value of the Word as opposed to the record, have spoken as if the record, were a thing of small moment, and as if God made the declaration of His mind and will to us for our salvation apart from, and independently of, the record of

¹ Cf. Speech in Assembly of 1878. *Proceedings*, p. 127.

Scripture. They have imagined such an opposition between Word and record as to teach that, while the record is of value to young, untaught and unformed believers, the trained and educated Christian, by means of what they have sometimes called the Inner Light, can either dispense with the record altogether, or use it to convey such meanings as this inward illumination, which they say they possess, reads into the record. This was not the doctrine of the Reformers, nor is it the idea of Prof. Robertson Smith. The witness of the Spirit witnesses to the truth of God for our salvation in, by and through the record of Scripture. The distinction between the Word of God and its record in Scripture is not explained by the common mystical illustration of kernel and husk, which husk (the record) can be thrown away when the kernel (the Word) has once been reached and laid hold of.

Nor can we rightly use the distinction between Word and record to mean that one part of the Bible is the Word of God and another part of it is the word of man. This is a common Broad Church view to which we must refer later on, and which seems based on the old mediæval conception of Scripture; but it is not the doctrine of Reformation and Protestant creeds, which uniformly teach that the substance of *all* Scripture is God's Word, and that what is not part of the record of God's Word is no part of Scripture. Some of Prof. Robertson Smith's opponents accused him of holding this Broad Church view, and no accusation was more indignantly denied by him.¹ He declared frequently that no one could accuse him of holding this opinion, who did not consciously or unconsciously accept the mediæval and discard the Reformation conception of the Bible.

The distinction between the Word of God, and Scripture its record, however real and true, must not prevent our being able to say that Scripture is the word of God. That

¹ Cf. Speech in Assembly, 1878. *Proceedings*, p. 127.

is a common expression, and, indeed, is used in the usual argument for the infallibility and authoritativeness of Scripture. The argument of our Westminster Confession, and of all Protestant theology, is:—

Because God is truth itself, His word is infallible ; and because He is Sovereign, it is authoritative.

But Scripture is the Word of God.

Therefore Scripture is infallible and authoritative.

But while this is the common argument, men have used it and understood the conclusion in different senses, and it is evident that the sense put upon the conclusion depends on the force of the word *is* in the proposition “ Scripture *is* the word of God.” It is here that the difference arises between Professor Robertson Smith and what may be called the Princeton School, and for this reason I shall have to refer to it later on. Meanwhile, it is sufficient to say that many seventeenth century theologians, departing from the spirit of Reformation theology, used the copula *is* to denote logical identity. They pressed the word as strictly as Lutherans and Romanists do in the famous controversy on the words “ This *is* my body.” But this was not the view of the Reformation divines, nor is it the idea conveyed in the great Reformed Confessions. The copula *is* does not mean logical identity. The word of God and Scripture may be put together in the phrase, The Scripture is the Word of God, and yet *is* may not mean exact logical equivalence. To show the oneness and the difference, many orthodox confessions used the term *contained in* or *contains* instead of *is*. The fifth article of the French Confession speaks of the Word as *contained in* the Bible. Calvin says the “ Word is to be sought for in the Holy Scriptures *wherein it is contained*,” and speaks of the Word of God as *presented* in Scripture. The standards of our Church have both expressions. The Westminster Confession says, “ Holy Scripture is the Word of God written,” which is equivalent to

“Scripture is the Word of God,” and the Shorter Catechism says, “The Word of God which *is contained* in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.” All this goes to prove that while it is correct to say that Scripture *is* the Word of God, and that what may be said of the one may also be said generally of the other, the copula *is* cannot be held to express logical identity, but some such relation as can be more exactly rendered by *contains* or *presents*. Prof. Robertson Smith, with that cautious conservatism which characterized him when dealing with dogmatic questions, hesitated to use these time-honoured phrases, and to avoid the Broad Church inference, selected the expression “Scripture *records* or *conveys* the Word of God.” The main thing to observe, however, is that while we must carefully insist on the real distinction between the Word of God and Scripture, we are not to make such a use of that distinction as to infer that we cannot predicate of the substance of Scripture those attributes of infallibility and authoritative-ness which belong to the Word of God. We can rightly say the Scripture is of infallible truth and divine authority, but when we say so, we must remember that the more precise statement will be, Scripture records or conveys to us the infallible and authoritative Word of God.

3. From all this it follows that when we speak of the infallible and authoritative character of Scripture, the infallibility and authoritativeness belong primarily to the Word of God, and only secondarily to Scripture, and belong to Scripture because it is the record which contains, presents, or conveys the Word of God. And this Word of God is, as we have seen, nothing else than the personal manifestation to us for our salvation of God and His will, the declaration of what is in God’s heart with regard to us. It is this which, in the first and highest sense, is infallible and authoritative. No careful student of the confessional literature of the Reformed Church can help seeing that the

writers say nothing about Scripture, save in so far as it is a record of spiritual truths, of God's revelation of Himself and of His will. Holy Scripture, the Westminster Confession tells us, is Scripture because it gives us that knowledge of God and of His will which is necessary unto salvation. Scripture is Scripture because it records God's manifestation of Himself and of His will to His people. It is Scripture because we see in all its parts held forth to us the will of God for our salvation; because it presents to the eye of faith God Himself personally manifested in Christ. It is this presentation of God Himself and of His will for our salvation which is of infallible truth and divine authority, and the infallible truth and divine authority of Scripture mean simply its infallible truth and divine authority as a record of God's saving revelation of Himself and of His will; but this revelation of God Himself and of His will is a spiritual manifestation of a supernatural reality, and is to be apprehended by a spiritual faculty which, as the Westminster Confession teaches, is faith. "By this faith a Christian believeth to be true whatsoever is revealed in the Word, for the authority of God speaketh therein; and acteth differently upon that which each particular passage thereof containeth; yielding obedience to the commands, trembling at the threatenings, and embracing the promises of God for this life and for that which is to come. But the principal acts of faith are accepting, receiving, and resting upon Christ alone for justification, sanctification, and eternal life, by virtue of the covenant of grace."¹ The Word consists of God's commands, threatenings, promises, addressed to our faith, and above all of the Gospel offer of Christ to us, and these are conveyed to us in every part of Scripture. These and none other are the things which *faith* receives as infallibly true and authoritative, and the confessions of the Reformed Church do not

¹ Ch. xiv. § 2.

recognise an infallibility and authoritativeness which is apprehended otherwise than by faith. And what awakens faith, and enables it to see this infallibility and authoritativeness in what is conveyed in Scripture, is the witness of the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit accompanies the Word as it is brought to us in Scripture with exactly the same testimony whereby He assured the Prophets and Apostles that the Word which they preached was God's Word, and not their own. "The witness of the Spirit does not attach itself to the outward characters of the record (1 Cor. ii. 1-5); but testifies directly to the infallible truth of the Divine Word, the spiritual teaching, the revelation of God Himself, which is the substance of the record. . . . This argument is a sure ground of faith to any one who keeps clearly in view the fundamental Reformation position that the Word of God is nothing else than the personal manifestation to us for salvation of God and His will. God's Word is the declaration of what is in God's heart with regard to us. And so its certainty lies in its substance, not in the way in which it comes to us. "The Word itself," says Calvin, "*however it be presented to us, is like a mirror in which faith beholds God*" (*Inst.*, III. ii. 6). So long as we go to Scripture, only to find in it God and His redeeming love mirrored before the eye of faith, we may rest assured that we shall find living, self-evidencing, infallible truth in every part of it, and that we shall find nothing else. But to the Reformers this was the whole use of Scripture. . . . Now since Scripture has no other end than to convey to us a message which, when accompanied by the inner witness of the Spirit, manifests itself as the infallible Word of God, we may, for practical purposes, say that Scripture *is* the infallible Word of God. For Scripture *is*, essentially, what it is its business to convey." ¹

Prof. Robertson Smith, therefore, in common with the

¹ *Answer to Form of Libel*, pp. 25, 26.

Reformers and the most conspicuous Reformed confessions, holds that infallibility and authoritativeness belong to the sphere of faith and of the witness of the Spirit, and, therefore, belong to that personal manifestation of God and of His will toward us which is conveyed to us in every part of Scripture. But this manifestation is given in a course of events which are part of human history, in lives of men and peoples, in a record which in outward form is like other human writings. If every part of Scripture be the manifestation of God, every part of it is also human. The supernatural reality is encased in human realities. To apprehend the former it is necessary to use faith enlightened by the witness of the Holy Spirit; but with regard to the historical credibility of Scripture it is sufficient to use the ordinary methods of research. The unanimous doctrine of the Reformed Churches is so constructed as to make the authority of the Bible, which belongs to the region of faith, altogether independent of questions that may be raised as to the human agencies by which the book came into its present shape. It is not a matter of faith when the books that record God's Word were written, or by whom, or in what style, or how often they were edited and re-edited. It is not a matter of faith whether incidents happened in one century or another; whether Job be a literal history, or a poem based on old tradition in which the author has used the faculty of invention to illustrate the problems of God's providence and man's probation; whether genealogical tables give the names of individual men, or of countries and peoples. All these belong to the human side of the record. No special supernatural illumination is required to apprehend and understand them. They are matters for the ordinary faculties of man, and subjects for ordinary human investigation. The Bible is a part of human literature as well as the record of Divine revelation. As such God has given it to us, and so He has

laid upon us the duty, and given us the right, to examine it as literature, and to determine all its human and literary characteristics by the same methods of research as are applied to the analysis of other ancient books.

4. While the Bible is human literature, it is the record of Divine revelation, and it is part of the doctrine of Scripture held by Prof. Robertson Smith in common with the Reformers, that God has taken special care that the literature has been preserved in order to be a suitable record of the Divine Revelation. Accordingly the Westminster Confession declares that the record of God's revealed Word has been framed and preserved in a special way, and under "the singular care and providence of God," lest any age of His Church should be left without a full and unmistakable declaration of His saving will. As a result of this singular care and providence His Word has been so preserved that God still speaks to us as clearly as He spake by the apostles and prophets, and the Scripture is such a correct and adequate record that the Holy Spirit accompanies the Word as it is brought to us in the Scriptures, and assures us that in these Scriptures God still speaks to us. It is to be remembered also that the Reformed Confessions do not speak as if this singular care and providence of God were exercised for a certain time, say until the original written record was finished, and then ceased. It is still at work: for its purpose is, in the words of the Westminster Confession, to keep the record "pure *in all ages*, and therefore authentic." ¹ Scripture is not the record of a Word which was once perfect for God's purpose, but which may have been corrupted in transmission. It is the record of a Word which still speaks with infallible truth and personal authority to us, and will do so to believers while the world lasts. The record of revelation was so framed and has been so preserved as

¹ Chap. i., § 8

to include everything necessary to enable us to understand the declaration of God's will in its historical context and historical manifestation, and the value of the whole Bible lies in the fact that directly or indirectly every part serves to convey to us an infallible declaration of the saving will of God. The perfect adaptation of the Bible to this end may be, and in matter of fact is, quite unaffected by the fact that the text as we now have it contains some marks of human imperfection, some verbal and historical errors.¹ God has not withheld from this imperfect letter the witness of His Spirit in the heart of the believer, commending it as His own infallible declaration of redeeming love, as His own perfect rule of faith and life, and we must be careful not to assume that because God has given us a Bible, perfect for His own divine purpose, the letter of Scripture must therefore have all such minor perfection as we in our frailty suppose needful. In all such matters "it is plain that the only honest and reverent way of dealing with the letter of Scripture is to allow it to speak for itself. We have it as a fact that in laying His Word before us as He does this day—for the Bible, as we have it, is a gift direct from God to us, and not a mere inheritance from the earlier Church—God has employed a series of human agencies, and in the use of these agencies has not excluded every human imperfection. If we are to have a trustworthy revelation at all, it is necessary that the one record of revelation which God has given us be such that we can feel sure that it tells us all we need to know of God and His will, and that it tells us this with unvarying and infallible truth, not mingling God's message with doctrines of man. So much is witnessed in our hearts by God's own Spirit. . . . Everything more than this is a question of the letter, and not of the Spirit, a question of

¹ It may be observed that I am not discussing the modern question of "inerrancy," an interesting enough subject of speculative enquiry, but which to my mind has no *practical* connection with the reformed doctrine of Scripture.

the human agency employed, and not of the Divine truth conveyed.”¹

Such was the doctrine of Holy Scripture formulated and held by Prof. Robertson Smith, and which was in all essential parts that stated by Calvin and the other great leaders of the Reformation period. I have endeavoured to state it in his own words, and those who are familiar with his writings will recognise familiar words or phrases of his in almost every sentence.

It now remains to point out briefly how this doctrine of Scripture differs from the common Broad Church view, and from what has been called the doctrine of the Princeton School.

The Broad Church theologians, doubtless under the influence of the earlier evangelical school of the Church of England, a school eminent for its saintly piety, but not conspicuous for its acquaintance with theology and its history, took for granted that the use of Scripture was to give clear views of truth, rather than to give fellowship with a self-revealing God. For it is curious how the majority of the evangelicals, notwithstanding their sturdy abhorrence of popery, really held what was essentially the mediæval as opposed to the Reformation idea of Scripture. The Bible was for them a storehouse of infallible truths about God and His salvation, a revealer of doctrines and rules for conduct. They used typology in much the same way as the mediæval theologians employed the fourfold sense, to extract doctrinal truths from unlikely sources, such as the description of the temple and its furniture. The great Reformation thought of the witness of the Spirit was either ignored, or thrust into a very subordinate place. Their Broad Church successors, all trained in this school, feel the insuperable difficulties of the position. Starting from the idea that the essential function of Scripture was

¹ *Answer to the Form of Libel*, p. 30.

not to give fellowship with God, but to communicate truths about God and given by God, they saw that there was much in the Bible that could scarcely be so described. They accordingly laid hold on the genuine distinction between the Word of God and Scripture, or the Bible, the record of the Word, and making an illegitimate use of the old phrase that the Scriptures contained the Word of God, they purposed a sharp distinction between the Word of God and the Scriptures which contained it. This enabled them to say that those parts of Scripture which did not appear to them to give divine utterances, although in Scripture, were not the Word of God, and this led to the general conclusion that part of the Scripture was and part was not the Word of God. It was apparently thought easy to divide the various portions of the Bible into the two flocks of sheep and goats, and it was left very much to each reader to make the division for himself. The view is totally different from that held by Prof. Robertson Smith. Let me quote his own words: "Some modern writers have twisted the old Calvinist expression (*the Word of God is contained in the Bible*) in a new sense. People now say that Scripture *contains* God's Word when they mean that part of the Bible is the Word of God, and another part is the word of man. That is not the doctrine of our churches, which hold that the substance of *all* Scripture is God's Word. What is not part of the record of God's Word, is no part of Scripture."¹ Besides, this school has never grasped the idea of the witness of the Spirit, and the relation of this witness to the attributes of infallibility and authoritativeness.

The divergence of the views of what have been termed the Princeton School from the doctrine of Scripture, stated in this article, require much more careful exposition, and I fear that it is not possible to put the case very clearly in the brief space that remains to me.

¹ *Answer to the Form of Libel*, p. 24, note.

The divergence really begins, as I have already said, in the effect of the distinction drawn between the Word of God and the Bible, or Scripture, which is the record conveying that Word to us. Many of the later seventeenth century divines, both Lutheran and Calvinist, insisted on reading the copula *is* in the sentence: *the Scripture is the Word of God*, as if it expressed absolute identity of subject and predicate. They rejected all more precise expressions such as *contains*, or *presents*, or *conveys*. In their view there was no difference whatever between the Word of God and Scripture, except perhaps that the former was unwritten, while the latter was written. This idea completely obliterated the distinction between the substance of Scripture, or the Word of God, and the letter of Scripture, or the record which conveyed that word to us; and in so doing it transferred the attributes of infallibility from the substance to the letter. This transference of interest from the Word of God to the record of the word, perhaps unconsciously, but nevertheless really, diminished the religious element in the doctrine of Scripture. No space was left for the over-mastering spiritual self-manifestation of God drawing near to man in Scripture, and there is no need to dwell upon the thought that faith is required to grasp this great supernatural reality, and that faith itself must be enlightened by the witness of the Spirit, which at once reveals and guarantees the infallibility and authoritativeness of the manifestation. These attributes of the divine Word are transferred from the sphere of faith and of the witness of the Spirit to which they really belong, to the sphere of the letter or literary record of Scripture. Accordingly it was customary to prove the perfection, authoritativeness and infallibility of Scripture, not by reference to the witness of the Spirit, but by bringing forward a whole variety of minor perfections said to belong to the letter of Scripture, and all witnessing to its divine attributes. The doctrine of the

witness of the Spirit which is placed in the fore part of Calvin's doctrine of Scripture and which occupies such a large place in every confession of the Reformed Church, is either left out entirely or relegated to a very subordinate place. In more modern writers the transference referred to has had the curious result of almost banishing a doctrine of Scripture from many treatises on dogmatic, and substituting in its place a doctrine of inspiration, which becomes an explanation of how a literary record can in itself, and not because it conveys the Word of God, become perfect, infallible, and authoritative. But to trace and to explain the many divergences between the doctrine of the Reformers and of Prof. Robertson Smith, and what is commonly called the doctrine of the Princeton School, would require an article by itself. Perhaps what has been said may indicate the lines on which that article would run.

THOMAS M. LINDSAY.

ON THE MEANING OF ΠΡΟΣΗΛΥΤΟΣ IN THE SEPTUAGINT.

It seems to be a generally received opinion that the Greek word *προσήλυτος* has a twofold signification. The lexicons are uniformly in agreement upon this point. Thus Thayer: "*προσήλυτος*. 1. A new-comer, a stranger, alien (Schol. ad Apoll. Rhod., i. 834; LXX. often for ἄλλο). 2. A proselyte"—and to the same effect Schleusner (who quotes in support of the first meaning *Lex Cyrilli*, MS. Bremen, *προσήλυτος, ἔπαικος, πάροικος, ξένος*; and Hesychius, *προσήλυτος, πάροικος, ἄλλοεθνής*); Sophocles (who for the same meaning refers to some LXX. passages and to Philo. i. 160, 42; ii. 219, 27), the *Thesaurus Linguae Græcæ* ab Hæne. Stephano Constructus (which refers to Hesychius,

Schleusner, and Schol. ad Apoll. Rhod., i. 834), and Liddell and Scott.

It will be plainly seen from these quotations that for *προσήλυτος* = stranger (*advena*) there are three chief supposed authorities: the LXX., Philo, and the Scholiast on Apollonius of Rhodes.

Now of these three, an examination of Philo's use of the word proves clearly that he is in some cases simply paraphrasing a passage from the LXX., in others using the word in the sense "proselyte."

With regard to the Scholiast, he certainly seems to use the word as meaning "stranger," "foreigner," for he combines it with *μετοίκους*. But here it may be noticed—firstly, that this is too isolated a case to bear much weight; secondly, that if, as we propose to show, the word originally meant "proselyte," it would be natural that it should soon draw to itself something of the meaning involved in such words as "stranger," "*advena*," "alien"; a proselyte generally being, as a matter of necessity, a "stranger in a strange land."

For *προσήλυτος* = "stranger," we are thus thrown back upon the LXX. This version uses the word as equivalent to the Hebrew *גֵר*, and it will clear the ground if something be said first of this latter word. In Biblical Hebrew *גֵר* = a sojourner, or stranger living under the protection of a tribe or family, who has, therefore, no inherited rights. In the Mishna the word means simply a proselyte in the technical sense of the word. (See Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, ii., p. 566, n. 292.) In the so-called Priestly Code, the word may be seen developing into this latter sense. (See Robertson Smith, *O. T. in J. C.*, 2nd ed., p. 342, n. 1.)

Now to translate *גֵר*, the LXX. uses sometimes *προσήλυτος* sometimes *πάροικος*, and it is generally asserted that the two words are synonymous. Schürer, *e.g.*, takes this

for granted. Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 353 ff., devotes a page and a half to illustrate it. And yet the version itself, when carefully examined, tells a very different tale. A consideration of the following facts will, I believe, lead to the certain conclusions (1) that *προσήλυτος* is not synonymous with *πάροικος*; (2) that it does not mean “*advena*,” “stranger,” “sojourner,” in the sense of the old Hebrew גֵר; (3) that its original meaning, so far as the extant literature enables us to judge, was “proselyte.”

In other words, in the great majority of cases where גֵר occurs in the Hebrew text, the Greek translators have not simply translated into the exact Greek equivalent, but have read into the word the later meaning which it has in the Mishna.

The references are always to the Hebrew text.

A. The LXX. translates גֵר in the sense of “a sojourner” by *πάροικος*.

So Gen. xv. 13, Israel in Egypt.

„ xxiii. 4, Abraham at Shechem.

Exod. ii. 22, Moses in Midian.

„ xviii. 3, Moses in Midian.

Deut. xiv. 21, “גֵרֵי.”

„ xxiii. 8, Israel in Egypt.

2 Sam. i. 13, Amalekite (but Ἄ *προσήλυτος*.)

1 Chron. xxix. 15, גֵרִים אֲנַחְנוּ. Luc. has *προσήλυτοι*.

Ps. xxxix. 13, גֵר אֲנִי.

Jer. xiv. 8, לִמְוָה תְהִיָּה כְגֵר.

Ps. cxix. 19, גֵר אֲנִי.

In all these passages גֵר clearly cannot mean a proselyte, but must denote members of a tribe or nation sojourning in a strange land. The only possible exception is Deut. xiv. 21. But to the LXX. translator it would be repugnant, or rather impossible, to think of a proselyte partaking of גֵבּוּלָה, in contradiction to the commandment laid down in

Lev. xvii. 15. He therefore took גֵּר as = a sojourner, and synonymous with the parallel נִכְרִי.

On the other hand, the LXX. translates גֵּר in the sense of "proselyte" by προσήλυτος.

So in Exod. xii. 48, must be circumcised to keep Passover.

„ „ 49, one law for home-born and גֵּר.

„ xx. 10, must keep the Sabbath.

„ xxii. 20, not to be oppressed.

„ xxiii. 9², not to be oppressed.

„ „ 12, Sabbath to be kept that גֵּר may rest.

Lev. xvi. 29, not to work on day of Atonement.

„ xvii. 8, may offer sacrifices.

„ „ 10, not to eat blood.

„ „ 12, not to eat blood.

„ „ 13, to let out blood of game.

„ „ 15, is unclean if he eats נבלה.

„ xviii. 26, to keep statutes previously mentioned.

„ xix. 33, not to be oppressed.

„ „ 10, gleanings for גֵּר.

„ „ 34, to be equal with *αὐτόχθων*.

„ xx. 2, not to give his seed to Moloch.

„ xxii. 18, may present offerings.

„ xxiii. 22, gleanings.

„ xxiv. 16, not to blaspheme.

„ „ 22, one *lex talionis* for גֵּר and אֹזֶרָה.

„ xxv. 23, metaphorical.

„ „ 35, metaphorical.

„ „ 47², Israelite may be sold to him.

Num. ix. 14², one law of Passover for גֵּר and אֹזֶרָה.

„ xv. 14, may offer sacrifice.

„ „ 15², one law, etc.

„ „ 16, one law, etc.

„ „ 26, atonement to be made for him.

„ „ 29, one law, etc.

„ „ 30, to be punished, if he defies the law.

- Num. xix. 10, ashes of heifer.
 „ xxxv. 15, may use cities of refuge.
 Deut. i. 16, “his proselyte” (strange).
 „ v. 14, must keep Sabbath.
 „ x. 18² (Heb. once only), Jahveh loves the גֵּר.
 „ „ 19, love the גֵּר.
 „ xiv. 29, may eat tithes.
 „ xvi. 11, may rejoice at Feast of Weeks.
 „ „ 14, may rejoice at Feast of Booths.
 „ xxiv. 14, wages not to be held back.
 „ „ 17, judgment not to be wrested.
 „ „ 19, gleanings.
 „ „ 20, gleanings.
 „ „ 21, gleanings.
 „ xxvi. 11, to rejoice at firstfruits.
 „ „ 12, to eat tithes.
 „ „ 13, to eat tithes.
 „ xxvii. 19, judgment not to be wrested.
 „ xxviii. 43, threat that the גֵּר will obtain
 supremacy over Israelite.
 „ xxix. 10, present at reading of law.
 „ xxxi. 12, present at reading of law.
 Josh. viii. 33, present at reading of law.
 „ „ 35, present at reading of law.
 „ xx. 9, may use cities of refuge.
 1 Chron. xxii. 2, gathered by David for service in the
 Temple building.
 2 „ ii. 16, gathered by Solomon for service in the
 Temple building.
 2 „ xxx. 25, rejoice at Hezekiah’s Passover.
 Ps. xciv. 6, אֱלֹהֵינָהּ וְגֵר יְהִרְגֵנִי.
 „ cxlvi. 9, שִׁמְרֵם אֶת־גֵּרִים.
 Jer. vii. 6 }
 „ xxii. 3 } not to be oppressed.
 Ezek. xiv. 7,

Ezek. xxii. 7,

„ „ 29,

„ xlvii. 22, to inherit with the Israelites,

„ „ 23, to inherit with the Israelites.

Zach. vii. 10, not to be oppressed.

Mal. iii. 5, have been oppressed.

The only cases here which could cause doubt are Lev. xxv. 23, 35; Deut. i. 16; and Exod. xii. 48. But there is another group of passages which forms a remarkable exception to the rule, those namely where גֵּרִים is used of the Israelites in Egypt and yet is rendered by προσήλυτοι, not by πάροικοι, as we should expect. They are—

Exod. xxii. 20.

Lev. xix. 34.

„ xxiii. 9.

Deut. x. 19.

But in all these גֵּרִים in the sense of proselyte has immediately preceded, and the sense involves the use of the same word: “for ye were proselytes,” not of course in the technical sense of the word, but “ye were in the land of Egypt in the same position of homeless strangers as are proselytes amongst yourselves.” Another exceptional case is Exod. xii. 19, where LXX. has γειώρας, but Ἀ. Σ. προσήλυτοι. Targ. גֵּוֹרִים.

B. Again the LXX. translates גֵּרִים used of a sojourner by

παροίκους, Ps. cv. 12.

παροικῶν, Judg. xix. 1.

παροικοῦντες, 2 Sam. iv. 3.

παρώκει, Judg. xix. 16.

παρώκησαν, 1 Chron. xvi. 19.

παρώκει, Judg. xvii. 7.

παροικεῖ, Deut. xviii. 16.

„ Ezra i. 4.

διατρίβετε, Jer. xxxv. 7.

γείτονες, Job. xix. 15.

συσκήνου, Exod. iii. 22.

προσκειμένῳ, Lev. xxv. 6.

ὄντων, Lev. xxv. 45.

But when used of a proselyte, by—

προσελθόντι, Exod. xii. 49.

προσκείμενος, Lev. xvi. 29.

„ „ xvii. 10.

„ „ „ 12.

„ „ „ 13.

προσγενόμενος, Lev. xviii. 26.

προσπορευόμενος, Lev. xix. 34.

γεγεννημένων, Lev. xx. 2.

προσκείμενος, Num. xv. 15.

„ „ 16.

„ „ 26.

„ „ 29.

„ „ xix. 10.

„ Josh. xx. 9.

προσηλύτους τοὺς }
παροικούντας } 2 Chron. xv. 9.

παροικοῦσι, Ezek. xlvii. 22.

προσήλυτος, „ 23.

C. Further, the LXX. translates נָגַד in sense of “to sojourn” by—

παροικεῖν.

Gen. xii. 10.

„ xix. 9.

„ xx. 1.

„ xxi. 23.

„ „ 34.

„ xxvi. 3.

„ xxxii. 5.

„ xxxv. 27.

„ xlvii. 4.

Exod. vi. 4.

Deut. xxvi. 5.

Judg. xvii. 8.

„ 9.

παροικεῖν.

Ruth i. 1.

2 Kings viii. 1.

„ 2.

Ps. cv. 23.

Isa. xvi. 4.

„ lii. 4.

Jer. xlv. 14. (?)

„ l. 40.

Lam. iv. 15.

Cf. also Judg. v. 17.

Ps. v. 5.

„ xv. 1.

„ lxi. 5.

In the last chapters of Jeremiah LXX. uses

<i>κατοικεῖν</i> xlii. 15 = LXX. xlix. 15	}	<i>A. προσηλυτεύειν.</i> <i>Σ. παροικεῖν.</i>
„ 22 „ „ 22.		
xlix. 18 „ xxix. 18.		
„ 33 „ xxx. 11.		
xliii. 5 „ 1. 5		<i>A.Σ. παροικεῖν.</i>
xliv. 8 „ li. 8.		
„ 28 „ „ 28		<i>A.Σ. παροικεῖν.</i>
<i>ἐνοικεῖν</i> , xlii. 17 „ xlix. 17.		
<i>οἰκεῖν</i> , xliii. 2 „ 1. 2.		

But the same version translates גֵּר when used of a proselyte by—

<i>προσέρχομαι</i> , Exod. xii. 48.
„ Lev. xix. 33.
„ Num. ix. 14.
„ Isa. liv. 15 (mistranslation).
<i>προσγίνομαι</i> , Num. xv. 14.
<i>προσηλυτεύω</i> , Ezek. xiv. 7.
<i>πρόσκειμαι</i> , Lev. xvii. 8.

It should be added that the LXX. c. 10 times translates מגור or מגורים, where they mean sojourning, by *παροικεῖν* or its derivatives.

The distinction so clearly drawn by the LXX. translators between גֵּר = “a sojourner,” and גֵּר = “a proselyte,” and again between גֵּר, when it means “to sojourn,” and גֵּר, when it is used of a proselyte, is also carried out in the Targums, the Syriac, and the Ethiopic.

The Targums seem to follow the LXX.

Thus *A*, גֵּר = sojourner = *πάροικος* = דִּיר c. 6 times.

„ = „ = „ = תותב ערל, Deut. xiv. 21.
= גיורא, 2 Sam. i. 13.

Ps. xxxix. 13.

In Deut. xiv. 21 תותב ערל is no doubt used for the same reason that the LXX. renders by *πάροικος*, because it was

inconceivable that a proselyte should be represented as eating, נִבְּלָה (Aq. however has *προσήλυτος*).

In 2 Sam. i. 13 the Targum, differing from the LXX., sees in the Amalekite who brought news of the battle of Mount Gilboa a proselyte in the technical sense of the term. So also the Syriac and Aquila.

But גַּר = proselyte = *προσήλυτος* = אֲנִיִּר c. 68 times.

„ = „ = *γειώρας* = „ twice.

In Lev. xxv. 23, 35 the LXX. has *προσήλυτος* where we might have expected *πάροικος*. Here the Targum has דִּיִּרִין; Syriac, ܕܝܝܪܝܢ.

In Lev. xxv. 47 the M.T. has in clause *a* גַּר יְתוֹשֵׁב, and in clause *b* גַּר תּוֹשֵׁב. Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 356, has shown that in the latter case י should be restored. The Samaritan text has it. The LXX. also read it and rendered in both clauses *προσήλυτοι ἢ πάροικοι*. But the Targum sees in both cases the גַּר יְתוֹשֵׁב of the Mishna (Schürer, *Gesch. des Jud. Volkes zur Zeitalter J. Chr.*, ii. 567) and renders by עַרְל וְתוֹתָב and עַרְל תּוֹתָב.

In Deuteronomy xxviii. 43 the Targum again differs from the LXX. The latter saw in the passage a threat that the proselytes should be exalted over the Israelites. The Targum intensifies the denunciation when it renders by תּוֹתָב עַרְל.

B. The Targum renders גַּר = to sojourn = some derivative of *παροικεῖν*, by derivatives of the roots דוּר or יתב c. 6 times.

= *διατρίβειν* once.

= *γείτονες* once.

= *πρόσκειμαι* twice.

= *εἰμί* once,

but when used of a proselyte by אִיתְגִּייר, c. 16 times.

C. The Targum renders גַּר = to sojourn = *παροικεῖν*

by יתב or דור *c.* 25 times. In the last chapters of Jeremiah, where LXX. has for לגור, κατοικεῖν, ἐνοικεῖν, or οἰκεῖν, Targum has לאתותבא.

On the other hand, it renders גיר, when used of a proselyte, by איתגיר *c.* 6 times.

It 10 times renders מגור or מגרים = some derivative of παροικεῖν, by a derivative of יתב or גור.

In the case of the two following versions the Hexateuch only is referred to.

The usage in the case of the Syriac is rather peculiar. In Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, Joshua it renders גִּיר in either sense by ܩܝܪܘܬܐ or ܩܝܪܘܬܐ (ܩܝܪ = προσήλυτος = ܩܝܪܘܬܐ ܩܝܪܘܬܐ, Deut. x. 18; xiv. 29).

But in Leviticus and Numbers—

ܩܝܪ = sojourner = ܩܝܪܘܬܐ = ܩܝܪܘܬܐ (only Lev. xix. 34; xxv. 23; xxxv. 47).

ܩܝܪ = προσήλυτος = ܩܝܪܘܬܐ = ܩܝܪܘܬܐ ܩܝܪܘܬܐ, 26 times.

ܩܝܪ is commonly rendered by ܩܝܪܘܬܐ, occasionally by ܩܝܪܘܬܐ.

The Ethiopic translator follows the same principles.

ܩܝܪ = a sojourner = πάροικος = ܩܝܪܘܬܐ = ܩܝܪܘܬܐ 4 times; but ܩܝܪܘܬܐ represents προσήλυτος in Deut. xxviii. 43 (see above under Targ.); Exod. xx. 10 (προσήλυτος ὁ παροικῶν).

Notice also that ܩܝܪܘܬܐ is used to represent ܩܝܪܘܬܐ = πάροικος in Gen. xxiii. 4; Lev. xxv. 6, 23, 35, 47²; Num. xxxv. 15.

On the other hand—

ܩܝܪ = proselyte = προσήλυτος = ܩܝܪܘܬܐ = ܩܝܪܘܬܐ about 58 times.

ܩܝܪ = proselyte = γειώρας = ܩܝܪܘܬܐ = ܩܝܪܘܬܐ once.

In conclusion, some explanation is needed of two passages in which the LXX. translates ܩܝܪ by γειώρας. Why, if προσήλυτος has been uniformly used to translate ܩܝܪ when it was thought to signify proselyte, do the translators go out of their way to import a New-Hebrew and Aramaic word

in these two instances? There is here, it must be confessed, a difficulty, which is made much of by those who hold that *προσήλυτος* and *πάροικος* are synonymous terms. Geiger, for instance, sees here a proof that in these two places only did the translators see in גַּיְ a proselyte in the technical sense of the word. Hence the unusual word. Elsewhere גַּיְ meant for them "a sojourner." But this certainly goes too far. It creates numerous difficulties. A test case is perhaps the usage of the Greek translator of Deuteronomy. In twenty places he translates גַּיְ by *προσήλυτος*; in two only does he use *πάροικος*. In neither of these two could גַּיְ possibly mean "proselyte." In xxiii. 8 it is used of Israel in Egypt; in xiv. 21 it is said that גַּיְ בְּלֵה may be given to the גַּיְ. Now suppose that the two words are synonymous. Why does not the translator use them more impartially? Or if he prefers *προσήλυτος*, why does he go out of his way to use *πάροικος* just in the two places where the meaning "proselyte" is not admissible? The remaining case in Deuteronomy (x. 19) has already been explained. What we want is some explanation which will cover all the facts. But until that is forthcoming it is surely more simple to assume that the use of *γειώρας* in Exodus xii. 19, Isaiah xiv. 1, is due to some exceptional cause, than to be forced to the conclusion that *πάροικος* and *προσήλυτος* are synonymous terms. This supposition makes the distribution of the two terms an insoluble enigma. It forces us to ask—

1. Why the translators use *πάροικος* about eleven times, in all of which the meaning "proselyte" is inadmissible?

2. Why they never use *προσήλυτος* in such cases except in the passages referred to above, viz., Leviticus xxv. 23, 35; Deuteronomy i. 16; Exodus xii. 48, xxii. 20, xxiii. 9; Leviticus xix. 34; Deuteronomy x. 19, of which the first two are metaphorical, and the last four admit of an easy and simple explanation?

3. Why they use *προσήλυτος* about seventy-five times,

some sixty of which occur in the legal codes, where ῥῶ might well be supposed to mean "proselyte"; and why in these codes they never use *πάροικος* except in two or three passages where the meaning "proselyte" is impossible?

4. Why they make so remarkable a distinction in their renderings of ῥῶ and the participle ῥῶ, employing as a rule *παροικεῖν* or a cognate word, where they are used of sojourning in general; but where the subject is ῥῶ = *προσήλυτος*, using such verbs as *προσέρχομαι*, *προσγίνομαι*, *προσηλευτεύω*, *πρόσκειμαι*, *προσπορεύομαι*, which are so admirably calculated to express the position of one who was a proselyte in the religious sense?

W. C. ALLEN.

JUDGMENT ACCORDING TO TYPE.

Two at least of the chief convictions which sustain the heart of Humanity rest, in the last issue, on a basis of pure reason. One is the belief that the soul is immortal; the other is the belief that it will be judged. We repudiate the opposite because the annihilation of the spiritual and the confusion of the moral are unthinkable. "For my own part," says Mr. Fiske, "I believe in the immortality of the soul, not in the sense in which I accept the demonstrable truths of science, but as a supreme act of faith in the reasonableness of God's work." It is incredible that when the long evolution of nature has come to a head the flower should be flung away. This were to reduce design to a fiasco. "What can be more in the essential nature of things," writes Mr. W. R. Greg, in his *Enigmas of Life*, a very honest book, "than that the mere entrance into the spiritual state will effect a severance of souls?" It is incredible that the present failure of justice should end in no redress, and the immense wrongs of this life have no

“complement of recompence.” This were to reduce order to a fiasco, and put us all to “permanent intellectual confusion.” Pessimistic thinkers, whose reason has been deflected by the presence of an arrogant materialism, and moral triflers, whose conscience is satisfied with a deity of imbecile good nature—the *bon Dieu* of the French—may deny judgment; the one, because there is no soul, the other, because there is no judge. But the masters of thought in all ages and of all nations have accepted judgment as an axiom in the calculation of human life; they have used it as a factor in the creation of human history. Reference of every moral action to an eternal standard, revisal of every individual life by a supreme authority, are embedded in the creeds of the Race. The *Book of the Dead* was the sacred writing of the oldest civilization, and it describes how the soul is weighed in the intangible scales of righteousness. The Greek moralists conceived the Furies let loose on the guilty soul, and placed their abode behind the judgment seat of Areopagus. The “Bible of the Middle Ages” was a rehearsal of judgment, wherein not only the saints and sinners of the past, but those of that very day, received their due recompence of reward. Angelico wrought out his *Inferno* and *Paradiso* in a picture which fails somewhat on the left hand, where sinners are tormented by their own sins, because he was ignorant of sin, but succeeds gloriously on the right, where the glorified arrive in a flower-garden—which is the outer court of heaven—for he only of men had seen the angels. When the ages of faith had closed and every conviction of the past was put to the question, one belief still held an iron grip, and Michael Angelo painted his Judgment on the Pope’s Chapel of the Vatican. It is a picture which confuses and overwhelms one; it was an awful agony of Art; but it was also an intense reality of the soul.

We have a robust common sense of morality which

refuses to believe that it does not matter whether a man has lived like the Apostle Paul or the Emperor Nero. One may hesitate to speculate about the circumstances of the other world ; one may love the splendid imagination of the Apocalypse more than the vulgar realism of modern sentiment, but one can never crush out the conviction that there must be one place for St. John, who was Jesus' friend, and another for Judas Iscariot, who was His betrayer. It were unreasonable that this mad confusion of circumstances should continue, which ties up the saint and the miscreant together to the misery of both ; it were supremely reasonable that this tangle be unravelled and each receive his satisfaction. One has seen sheep and swine feeding in the same field till evening, and has followed till the sheep were gathered into their fold, and the swine ran greedily to their sty. The last complaint that would have occurred to one's mind was that their owners had separated them, the last suggestion that they should be herded together. What was fitting had happened ; it was separation according to type.

Jesus did not supersede this conviction as the superstition of an imperfect morality, nor condemn it as a contradiction of the Divine Love. His "enthusiasm of Humanity" did not blind Him to deep lines of moral demarcation ; His "huge tenderness" did not propose an equality for Judas and John. He did not come to reduce the moral order to an anarchy of grace, and to break the inevitable connection between sin and punishment. It has been said by a profound thinker that Antinomianism is the only heresy, and it is desirable to remind one's self, in a day of flabby sentiment, that Jesus was not an Antinomian. Had Jesus condemned sin, then He had been the destroyer of our Race, and not its Saviour, for the comforting of our heart had been a poor recompence for the debauchery of our conscience. But it is a conspicuous instance of Jesus' balance, that He combined the most tender compassion for the sinner with

the most unflinching condemnation of sin. It is Jesus who has compared sin unto Gehenna, "where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched" (St. Mark ix. 44); who places the rich man of soft and luxurious life in torment, so that he begs for a drop of water to cool his tongue (St. Luke xvi. 24); who casts the unprofitable servant into outer darkness, where is weeping and gnashing of teeth (St. Matt. xxv. 30); who declares that the fruitless branches of the vine will be gathered and burned (St. John xv. 6); who sends the servants of self into the fire prepared for the Devil and his angels. Jesus spake in parables, and it were folly to press His words into a description of circumstances. Jesus spake also with marked emphasis, and it were dishonesty to deny that He believed in the fact of judgment.

Jesus went with the general reason of the Race in affirming the certainty of judgment, and therein He is at one with the catholic creeds of Christendom. Jesus has also gone with the general reason in affirming the morality of judgment, and therein He has differed from that solitary creed which has raised uncharitableness into an article of faith. What has filled many honourable minds with resentment and rebellion is not the fact of separation, but the principle of execution; not the dislike of an assortment, but the fear that it will not be into good and bad. No power will ever convince a reasonable being that one man should be elected to life and have heaven settled on him as an entailed estate, and another be ordained to death and "be held in the way thereto"; or that one be "blessed" because he has held the orthodox creed, and another be "cursed" because he has made a mistake in the most profound of all sciences. If Heaven and Hell—be they places or states—are made to hinge on the arbitrary will of the Almighty, or on the imperfect processes of human reason, then judgment will not be a fiasco, it will be an outrage.

It will be a climax of irresponsible despotism, whose monstrous injustice would leave Heaven without blessing and Hell without curse.

Reason cannot agree with such a reading of judgment; reason cannot disagree with the reading of Jesus. Jesus never made judgment depend either on the will of God or the belief of man. He rested judgment on the firm foundation of what each man is in the sight of the Eternal. He anticipated no protest in his parables against the justice of this evidence: none has ever been made from any quarter. The wheat is gathered into the garner. What else could one do with wheat? The tares are burned in the fire. What else could one do with tares? (St. Matt. xiii. 40). When the net comes to the shore, the good fish are gathered into vessels; no one would throw them away. The bad are cast aside; no one would leave them to contaminate the good (St. Matt. xiii. 48). The supercilious guests who did not value the great supper were left severely alone. If men do not care for Heaven, they will not be forced into it. The outcasts, who had never dared to dream of such a supper, were compelled to come. If men hunger for the best, the best shall be theirs (St. Luke xiv. 15-24). The virgins who had taken the trouble of bringing oil went in to the marriage; they were evidently friends of the bridegroom: the virgins who had made no preparation were shut out from the marriage; they were mere strangers (St. Matt. xxv. 1-13). Had the foolish virgins been rejected because they were a few minutes late, they would have had just cause of complaint. When the bridegroom declined their company for the simple reason that He did not know them, they had no answer. It would be equally out of place either for friends to be refused, or strangers to force admission to a marriage. It is all fair and fitting—exactly as things ought to be: Jesus' judgment is the very apotheosis of reason.

Twice has the Judgment been described with authority—

once by the greatest prophet that has spoken outside the Hebrew succession, once by the chief prophet of Jew and Gentile. Plato has told us that the judges of the great assizes will sit at a place on the other side, where all roads from this world meet, and where, divided by the throne of justice, they part again into two—the way which leadeth to the Islands of the Blessed, and the way that goeth to the “House of Vengeance and Punishment, which is called Tartarus.” Men are not to appear before the judges in the body, lest justice should be partial, since there are many “having evil souls who are apparelled in fair bodies”: neither are the judges to be clothed, lest their bodies be “interposed as a veil before their own souls.” The judgment is to be absolutely real; each judge “with his naked soul shall pierce into the other naked soul,” and each soul will go to its own place. Just as bodies have a shape of their own, so is it with souls. Some are scarred by crimes, some are crooked with falsehood, some deformed by incontinence; these are despatched to Tartarus. Other souls show the fair proportions of holiness and truth, and on them the judges look with admiration as they go to the Islands of the Blessed. Nothing is arbitrary; everything is reasonable. It is registration rather than examination; it is fulfilment rather than judgment.

The Judgment of Plato is one of the supreme efforts of human reason, surely not unilluminated by the Spirit of God; and one compares it with the Judgment of Jesus to find a considerable difference in drapery, and an exact correspondence in principle. According to Jesus (St. Matt. xxv. 31), there will be a Judgment on the confines of the “Unseen Universe,” and each soul will appear before Him seated on the Throne of His glory. There will be instant division, but no confusion: it will be manifestation and confirmation. The sheep and the goats, which have been one flock in the pastures of this life, will fall apart each

breed according to its nature. Those who have lived the selfless life, who saw Him an hungered and gave Him meat, fulfilling the Law of Love, shall stand on one side, because by their choice they are of one kind; and those who have loved the self life, who saw Him a stranger and took Him not in, disobeying the Law of Love, shall stand on the other side, because by their choice they are of another kind. "Come, ye blessed" is said to the selfless, because by the constitution of the moral universe they cannot be anything else than blessed. "Depart, ye cursed" is said to the selfish because even God Himself could not prevent them being cursed. Their state in either case is "prepared," and is the inheritance of character. It is a recognition of fitness, as reasonable as an arrangement into species, as natural as the ripening of harvest.

Jesus makes a marked advance on Plato by magnifying the function of the Judge, and anticipating the date of the Judgment. The Judge in St. Matthew's Gospel is not an official referring to a Law: He is identical with the Law itself. Each soul is tried not by its obedience to a written standard, but by its relation to a living Person. Jesus' "Come" is the symbol of a Law, the Law of attraction. His "Depart" is the symbol of another Law, the Law of repulsion, and Jesus Himself is in both events the magnetic force. The personal factor, which is the heart of the religion of Jesus, asserts itself in the Judgment. Jesus monopolizes the outlook of life: He is the wounded Man the priest passes, whom the Samaritan helps. His acceptance or rejection is the test of the soul, and the crisis simply culminates at the Judgment. Human life will then finally break against Jesus as a rock in the midst of a stream, each current to follow its own direction unfettered and unmingled. The presence of Jesus is our Judgment.

We are accustomed to refer Judgment to the threshold of the other world. We ought to acclimatize the idea in

this world, for if Jesus once enlarged on the august circumstances of the future Judgment, He referred continually to the awful responsibility of a present Judgment. One can easily understand how the revelation of Jesus' moral Glory on the other side will raise to the highest power both His attraction and His repulsion, and suddenly crystallize into permanence the fluid principles of a man's life. The stream will be frozen in the fall. But this will only be the consummation of a process which is now in action. Jesus has not to wait for His Throne to command attention or affect the soul. He is the most dominant and exacting Personality in human experience from whose magical circle of influence none can tear himself. Can any one follow Jesus' life from Nazareth to Calvary, and stand face to face with Jesus' Cross, and be neither better nor worse? Incredible and impossible. Certain minds may hesitate over the Nicene Creed, but it is trifling to treat Jesus as a name in history, or a character in a book. He is the Man whom Plato once imagined, whom Isaiah prophesied, whom the most spiritual desire, who exhausts Grace and Truth. Beyond all question, and apart from all theories, Jesus is the Revelation of the Divine goodness: the incarnate Law of God: the objective conscience of Humanity. As soon as we enter the presence of Jesus we lose the liberty of moral indifference. One Person we cannot avoid—the inevitable Christ; one dilemma we must face, "What shall I do with Jesus which is called Christ." The spiritual majesty of this Man arraigns us at His bar from which we cannot depart till we become His disciples or His critics, His friends or His enemies. With certain consequences. Belief in Jesus is justification, for it is loyalty to the best; disbelief in Jesus is condemnation, it is enmity to the best. Jesus stated the position in a classical passage, "He that believeth on Him is not condemned: but He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in

the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil" (St. John iii. 18-19).

As the mere presence of a good man in a room will compel the silent opinion of every other person, and be their judgment, so Jesus was for three years, from His public appearance at Nazareth to His crucifixion on Calvary, a criterion of character and a factor of division. He was the problem burdening every man's intellect, the law stimulating every man's conscience, the life exciting every man's imagination, the figure by which all kinds of men adjusted themselves. According to the Gospels, every one was sensitive to Jesus. As soon as He was born wise men came from far to worship Him, and Herod sent soldiers to slay Him (St. Matt. ii.) When He was presented in the Temple, Simeon took the infant in his arms and spake by the Holy Ghost, "Behold, this child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel" (St. Luke ii. 34). If He preached in the synagogue of his boyhood, the people, under the irresistible influence of Jesus' Personality, "wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of His mouth," so strong was His power of attraction, and then would have "cast Him down headlong," so great was His power of repulsion (St. Luke iv. 16). If He visited a country town in Galilee, a Pharisee would invite Him to a feast in order to insult Him (St. Luke vii. 36), and a publican would make a "great feast in his own house" in order to honour Him (St. Luke v. 29). The people were divided over Jesus, "for some said, He is a good Man, others said, Nay, but He deceiveth the people" (St. John vii. 12), and the very Council was torn with controversy, the majority sending officers to arrest Him, but Nicodemus breaking silence in His defence (vii. 50). If two men disputed in those days, it was about Jesus; if they talked together by the way, it

was of Jesus; the atmosphere was electrical with Jesus. "Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?" asked Jesus of His disciples, for He knew they could not ignore Him. It was a day of judgment—searching and conclusive. To so many Jesus was the "Son of the living God" (St. Matt. xvi. 16), to so many "a man gluttonous and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners" (St. Matt. xi. 19). He was either the Rock on which wise men built (St. Matt. vii. 24), or the stone which would grind wicked men to powder (St. Matt. xxi. 44). Jesus was much impressed by the spectacle of this unconscious but decisive judgment. "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son. . . Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live. . . And (the Father) hath given Him authority to execute judgment also, because He is the Son of Man" (St. John v. 22-27).

Jesus compared Himself to the Light because it bringeth to the birth everything that is good in the world, and as Jesus fulfilled His course, elect souls were drawn to Him. Simeon saw Him only in His weakness, and was ready to "depart in peace"; John Baptist recognised Him of a sudden, and laid down his ministry at Jesus' feet; St. John spent one night with Him, and followed Him unto old age; St. Matthew heard one word from Him, and left all he had; a dying robber had the good fortune to be crucified beside Him, and acknowledged Him King of Paradise. There was a latent affinity between these men and Jesus. He was the Good Shepherd, and they were "His own sheep." "He calleth His own sheep by name. . . and the sheep follow Him" (St. John x. 3-4). Jesus also compared Himself to Light because it layeth bare every evil thing, and the light of Jesus raised sin to its height. The Sadducean priests accomplished His crucifixion, lest He

should diminish their Temple gains ; the Pharisees hated Him to death because he had exposed their hypocrisy ; the foolish people turned against Him because He would not feed them with bread ; Herod Antipas set Him at nought because Jesus did not play the conjuror for his amusement ; Pilate sent Jesus to the cross in order to save his office ; Judas Iscariot betrayed Him because he could now make no other gain of Him. There was a latent antipathy between these men and Jesus. "If God were your Father," Jesus said to such men once, "ye would love Me : for I proceeded forth from and came from God. . . Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do" (St. John viii. 42-44).

It was a drama of judgments, conducted in the face of the world for three years, with an evident justification and an evident condemnation, but the former did not of necessity imply a visible goodness, nor the latter a visible badness on the part of the judged. Those who approximated to the John type were not all saintly : St. Matthew was a publican, and St. Mary Magdalene was a sinner. There was simply one point in their favour, they hated their evil self and welcomed Jesus' cross. Those who approximated to the Judas type were not all evil livers : the Pharisees were careful about the works of the Law, and devoted to the cause of Judaism. There was only one point against them, they were satisfied with themselves, and were determined to have nothing to do with Jesus' cross. The children of Light are not so much those who have walked in the Light as those who love the Light. The children of darkness are not so much those who have walked in darkness as those who love darkness. There were men ready for Jesus because they had "an honest and good heart" (St. Luke viii. 15). There were men alien to Jesus because they were sensual and hypocrites. It is a question not so much of action as of bias.

Jesus knew that it was not possible to divide men into two classes by the foliage of the outer life, as it is seen from the highway. Few people are saints or devils in their daily conduct: most are a mixture of good and bad. Below the variety of action lies the unity of principle. Some people have grave faults and yet we believe they are good; some are paragons of respectability and yet we are sure they are bad. No one would refuse St. Peter a place with Jesus, although he denied Him once with curses; none propose a place with Jesus for Judas, although he only committed himself once in public. An instinct tells us the direction of the soul; the trend of character. We concur with the judgment of Jesus, Who said of Judas, "One of you is a devil" (St. John vi. 70); but of St. Peter, "Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat, but I have prayed for thee" (St. Luke xxii. 31).

When Jesus judges by type, our Christ approximation, or our Christ alienation, one is struck by His absolute fairness. We are estimated not by what we have done but by what we desire to be. With Jesus the purpose of the soul is as the soul's achievement, and He will not be disappointed. If one surrender himself to Jesus, and is crucified on His cross, there is no sin he will not overcome, no service he will not render, no virtue to which he will not attain. He has made a good beginning, he has a long time. If one refuse the appeal of Jesus, and cling to his lower self, there is no degradation to which he may not descend. He has made a bad beginning, and he also has a long time. Both have eternity. We choose our type, and with God it is fulfilled; so that St. Mary Magdalene in her penitence was saved, and Simon in his self-righteousness lost already.

"All instincts immature,
 All purposes unsure,
 That weighed not as his work, yet swelled the man's account
 Thoughts hardly to be packed

Into a narrow act,
Fancies that broke through language and escaped;
All I could never be,
All men ignored in me,
This I was worth to God whose wheel the pitcher shaped."

Judgment by type sets the future in a new and solemn light. We can no longer think of Heaven as a state of certain happiness, and Hell as a state of certain misery for every man whatever may be his ideal. They are now relative terms, so that one man's Heaven might be another man's Hell. If one hunger and thirst for God, then for him is prepared the beatific vision and the eternal service. He has his heaven, and is satisfied. If one seek nothing beyond himself and his own gratification, then he will be left to himself, and taste the fulness of his lusts. He has his hell and is satisfied. St. John was already in Heaven with his head on Jesus' bosom. Judas was in Hell as he went into the outer darkness. Each was at home, the one with Jesus, the other away from Jesus. None need be afraid that he who has followed Jesus will miss Heaven, or that he who has made the "great refusal" will be thrust into Heaven. One is afraid that some will inherit Hell and be content.

JOHN WATSON.

*NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING ON THE SECOND
COMING OF CHRIST.*

IV. THE JOHANNINE WRITINGS.

A VERY important statement of Christ about His return to judge the world is found in John v. 25-29.

We have here, with stately repetition, two parallel assertions marked by conspicuous points of similarity and difference. The former is introduced by an emphatic formula

peculiar to, and very frequent in, the Fourth Gospel, "Verily, verily, I say to you." The latter assertion is designed to remove astonishment caused by the former: "marvel not at this, because," etc. Each assertion contains the solemn phrase, "there cometh an hour"; found also in chapter iv. 21, 23, referring to the Gospel dispensation now close at hand, in chapter xvi. 2, referring to the future persecution of the servants of Christ, in verse 25 referring to the fuller manifestation of Christ to His disciples, and in verse 32, referring to the dispersal of the disciples at the arrest of Christ. In the former of the two parallel assertions now before us, as in John iv. 23, our Lord adds, "and now is": but in the second assertion these words are conspicuously absent. This difference marks an important distinction. Verse 25 describes the immediate effect of the preaching of Christ and the Apostles: verses 28 and 29 refer to an event future even to us. In verse 24 Christ has already said that they who hear His word and believe in God who sent Him "have passed out of death into life." In the Gospel they have heard "the voice of the Son of God"; and it has given them "life." Their life is an outflow of the life which is in the Father and which He has given to be in the Son. And, by raising into new life those who hear His voice and them only, the Son performs an act of judgment. The solemn words, "an hour cometh and now is," call attention to the new and important era in the spiritual life of men created by the Gospel of Christ.

The astonishment evoked by the announcement of the gift of life to those who hear His voice, Christ removes, or rather supersedes, by a still more astonishing announcement touching another "hour" which also "cometh." Not only do the spiritually dead "now" hear the voice of Christ and rise into new life, but "an hour cometh" in the future when "all that are in the graves will hear His voice

and will go forth." No such universal statement as this is found in verse 25: for not "*all*," even of those to whom it is preached, will listen to, and receive life from, the Gospel. On the other hand, we are not told that all who are in the graves, though all will hear the resurrection voice, "will *live*." All "will go forth" from their graves; some to "life," others to "judgment." This distinction is important, and is maintained throughout the New Testament. Although the word *life* is frequently used indiscriminately for bodily life of all kinds on earth, beyond the grave it is always reserved for a holy and blessed existence with God. Consequently, our Lord could not say that all who are in the graves "will live," even though all will leave their graves. For not all who do so will escape from death. "A resurrection of *life*" is the privilege only of "those who have done the good things."

In this great passage, Christ puts in close juxtaposition two very different resurrections, each ushered in by His own voice, a spiritual resurrection in which those who accept the Gospel enter at once into spiritual life, and a resurrection at the last day when all the bodies of men laid in the grave will go forth, to life or to judgment, according to their works.

In close agreement with the above, we read in John vi. 39, and again with emphatic repetition in verses 40, 44, that "at the last day" Christ will raise those who now believe in Him and who thus have already eternal life. The same hope finds expression, from the lips of Martha, in chapter xi. 24. This mention of the last day carries forward the resurrection of the just to the close of the present order of things:

Up to this point we have found complete agreement, in the matter before us, between the various writers of the New Testament and the various types of thought therein embodied. St. Paul teaches that at a voice from heaven the

dead servants of Christ will rise, that all men will stand before Him in judgment, and that He will change the bodies of the just into the likeness of His own glorified body. The Synoptist Gospels represent Christ as teaching frequently that He will come from heaven with power and splendour and sit in judgment on the righteous and the wicked. And, in the passages just quoted, Christ asserts that at His voice all the dead will rise and will receive according to their works.

Other teaching different from, yet closely related to, the above meets us in the discourses of Christ to the Apostles on the night of His betrayal. He says, as recorded in John xiv. 18-20, "I will not leave you orphans; I come to you. Yet a little while and the world beholds Me no more, but ye behold Me: because I live, also ye will live. In that day ye will know that I am in My Father and ye in Me, and I in you." Similarly, in chapter xvi. 16, "A little while and no longer ye behold Me, and again a little while and ye will see Me." Also verses 22, 23, "Ye now have sorrow; but I will see you again and your heart will rejoice . . . and in that day ye shall ask Me nothing"; and verse 26, "in that day ye will ask in My name."

These words, in their full sense, refer evidently to the gift of the Spirit promised so conspicuously in chapters xiv. 16, 17, xvi. 13-15, immediately before the words quoted above. And they were abundantly fulfilled in the outpouring of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost. On that day and in that Spirit Christ entered into a fellowship with His disciples far closer than that which they had enjoyed during His life on earth; and in this sense returned to them after the separation caused by His death. We have here an inward and spiritual coming of Christ. And, inasmuch as this closer union was conditioned by the resurrection of Christ, we may speak of the bodily return of the risen

Lord to the disciples from whom He had been snatched by death as the beginning of this spiritual return. In other words, the fulfilment of the promise before us began in Christ's appearance to His disciples on the day of his resurrection; and was completed in the gift of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost. To this latter refers probably the phrase "in that day." The spiritual return was a real anticipation of the bodily return for which His disciples were eagerly waiting.

The coming of Christ at the end of the age is mentioned in John xxi. 22, "if I will that he remain till I come," in language similar to that of the Synoptist Gospels and of St. Paul.

In 1 John ii. 18 we read, "It is the last hour: and as ye have heard that Antichrist comes, even now are many antichrists arisen; whence we know that it is the last hour." The absence of the article twice, *ἔσχατη ὥρα ἐστίν*, indicates that the present time is marked by the characteristics of "a last hour." The Christian dispensation, which in one sense is the beginning of a new and glorious era of eternal life, in another aspect is the last portion of the present order of things. The use of the word "hour" to describe so long a period of time warns us not to press its use elsewhere as indicating a short period. But we notice that the Gospel dispensation, however long, is in a measure homogeneous. During the whole of it, amid various developments, God is governing the world in the same method. The words "Antichrist comes" recall the teaching of St. Paul in 2 Thessalonians ii. 8: and the statement that "even now are many antichrists arisen" is in close agreement with the preceding verse, "the mystery of iniquity already worketh."

We turn now to a book differing widely, in thought and expression, from all else in the New Testament and occupy-

ing there a position somewhat like that of the Book of Daniel in the Old Testament.

In Revelation i. 7, in close agreement with Daniel vii. 13, we read, "Behold, He cometh with the clouds, and every eye will see Him, and they who pierced Him; and all the tribes of the earth will wail before Him." Similarly in chapter iii. 11, xxii. 20, Christ says, "I come quickly"; adding in the latter passage, "and My reward is with Me, to give every man according as his work shall be." These are plain references to the return of Christ to judge the world.

In chapter ii. 5, we read, "but if not, I will come to thee and will remove thy lampstand out of its place, except thou repent." Similarly, verse 16, "repent; but if not, I come to thee quickly, and I will fight with thee with the sword of My mouth." Also chapter iii. 3, "if thou do not watch I will come as a thief, and thou wilt not know at what hour I will come to thee." These passages refer evidently to punishment inflicted, not at one definite moment at the close of the present order of things, but during the course of history. They thus stand related to the use of the term "Day of the Lord" by the prophets of the Old Covenant to describe any conspicuous national punishment.

The first four seals, in chapter vi. 1-8, open to us what seem to be consecutive historical pictures. At the fifth seal, in verses 9-11, we pass within the veil and hear impatient voices of the souls of the martyrs. The sixth seal opens to us a vision of the dissolution of nature, and we hear the cry of the lost, who tell us that "the great day of their anger is come." This can be no other than a picture of the final judgment. It is followed in chapter vii. by a vision of the sealed ones, led about by the Lamb as their shepherd, when "God will wipe away every tear from their eyes." At the seventh seal, chapter viii. 1, there is silence

in heaven, marking a pause in the series of visions; and we see seven angels with seven trumpets.

With the trumpets begins another series of apparently consecutive visions. But this second series as a whole seems to be parallel, not consecutive, to the first series. For the total dissolution of nature under the sixth seal cannot be followed by the partial destruction described as occurring under the first four trumpets. The second series, like the first, leads up to the great consummation. For at the seventh trumpet (Rev. xi. 15) we hear an announcement, "The kingdom of the world has become our Lord's and His Anointed's; and He shall reign for ever and ever." In chapter xiv. 14, we have a vision recalling again that of Daniel vii. 13: "And I saw and beheld a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sitting like a Son of Man, having on His head a golden crown and in His hand a sharp sickle." In chapter xvi. we have a third series, of bowls, evidently, like the seven trumpets, parallel to the seven seals and leading up to the great consummation. The consummation of judgment is delineated in chapters xvii. and xviii., where we have, in vivid picture, the destruction of a great hostile power, followed in chapter xix. 1-8 by the Hallelujahs of the saved.

Chapter xix. 11-21 takes us back into the conflict, and shows us One seated on a white horse and leading forth to battle the armies of heaven. Before His advance fall the beast and the false prophet into the lake of fire. The easiest explanation is that this picture delineates the struggle and victory and progress of the Gospel of Christ.

In chapter xx. 1, opens another vision, a sequel to that in chapter xix. 11-21. An angel descends from heaven, binds the serpent, and casts him into the abyss for a thousand years; after which long space of time he must needs be liberated for "a little time." The prophet adds, "And I saw thrones, and persons sat upon them, and

judgment was given to them." He saw also "the souls of those who were beheaded because of the testimony of Jesus and because of the word of God." It is not certain whether the words following, "such as did not worship the beast, neither his image," are a further description of the martyrs or describe another class of persons in addition to, or wider than, them, whom the prophet also saw, viz., the faithful servants of Christ. In the absence of decisive evidence, it is perhaps better to accept this latter wider interpretation. We are told that the persons referred to "lived," *i.e.* were alive when the prophet saw their souls, though some of them had been beheaded and all were undoubtedly dead; and that they "reigned with Christ a thousand years." But this does not imply that they began to live at the beginning of the thousand years, or ceased to live and reign at its close. Satan was bound for a thousand years and then loosed, and during the whole of this time the prophet saw the souls of the martyrs and perhaps of other faithful servants of Christ living and reigning with their Lord. The thousand years note an extension, but not necessarily a limitation, of time.

"The rest of the dead did not live": *i.e.* they had not, as the martyrs had, a higher life which survived the death of the body. The words following, "until the thousand years were completed," do not assert or suggest that at the close of this long period they came to life. The assertion is purely negative. During the whole thousand years, while the servants of Christ lived and reigned with Him, the rest of mankind continued in a state of death. But we are not told either that they came to life, or that the saints ceased to live and reign, at the end of this period.

Verse 6 is a comment upon, and reveals the real significance of, the statement in verse 4. The words, "This is the First Resurrection," stand in marked contrast to "the Second Death"; and suggest another resurrection described

n verses 12, 13. This collocation of thought recalls John v. 25-29, already expounded, where the two resurrections are placed side by side. The life enjoyed by the saints reigning with Christ may well be described as a resurrection: for they were once "dead by reason of sins" and have been raised by the voice of Christ (John v. 25, Ephesians ii. 5, 6) into new life. And, in contrast to the resurrection of the body "at the last day," it may correctly be called "the First Resurrection." They who experience this earlier and spiritual resurrection are "blessed and holy": for to them the resurrection of the body will be a "resurrection of life," and they will thus escape "the Second Death."

The place in which the saints will live and reign with Christ is not mentioned. Nothing is said here about their reigning on the earth; and the statement in chapter v. 10 has no reference to the millennium. Christ now sits at the right hand of God: and, in the absence of other indication, we may assume that the "souls" of the martyrs, whom the prophets saw, reign with Him in heaven. Of their bodily resurrection and return to the earth, there is, in the passage before us, no hint.

In verse 7 we read, "When the thousand years are completed, Satan will be loosed from his prison, and will go forth to deceive the nations." Then follows the great apostacy. A vast multitude are gathered together to besiege the holy city: but fire fell from heaven and consumed them, and the Devil was cast into the lake of fire where were already the beast and the false prophet.

Then follows, in words recalling Daniel vii. 10, Matthew xxv. 31-46, the dissolution of nature and the final judgment: "And I saw a great white throne and Him sitting upon it, from whose face fled the earth and the heaven and place was not found for them. And I saw the dead, the great and the small, standing before the throne, and books

were opened, and another book was opened which is the Book of Life; and the dead were judged from the things written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead in it, and Death and Hades gave up the dead in them; and each was judged according to their works." We have here indisputably the judgment of all men, good and bad, at the close of the present order of things, already described, in similar language, by St. Paul, and by Christ as His words are recorded both in the Synoptist Gospels and in the Fourth Gospel.

If, as we have just seen, Revelation xx. 11-15 is a description of the final judgment, the apostacy described in verses 8-10 is in close harmony with the teaching of Christ in Luke xvii. 26-30, where He compares His own second coming with the Flood and with the destruction of Sodom; and in still closer agreement with 2 Thessalonians ii. 3-12, where St. Paul teaches that the *παρουσία* of Christ will be preceded by the revelation and *παρουσία* of a new and terrible form of evil. Compare especially Revelation xx. 8, "He shall go forth to deceive the nations," with 2 Thessalonians ii. 9-11, "whose coming is according to the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders. . . . For this cause God sendeth them a working of error that they may believe a lie." In other words, the various writers of the New Testament agree to teach that Christ at His coming will find the world in deep sin, and that, to many who expect Him not, His coming will be sudden destruction.

The peculiarity of the passage before us is that it interposes between the time of writing and the final apostacy a period of a thousand years during which Satan is bound, while the martyrs and probably other dead servants of Christ live, and reign with Him; and that their life is described as the First Resurrection. This binding of Satan for a limited though long time, followed by liberation and renewed activity, is an element not found elsewhere through-

out the entire Bible. This being the case, it must be interpreted with utmost caution, and in the light of whatever teaching in the Bible most nearly approaches it.

The splendid visions of the prophets, *e.g.* the concluding chapters of the Book of Isaiah, do not help us much, for in them we have no hint of subsequent apostacy; and for the more part the language used excludes the possibility of apostacy. The nearest parallel, in the prophets, to the passage before us, is to be found in Ezekiel xxxvii.—xxxix. The vision opens in a valley of dry bones. At the voice of the prophet, breath entered into them and the dead woke up into new life. This is explained to be a prophecy of national revival. And with the revived nation God makes a covenant of peace. Then comes an onslaught of distant Gentile nations led by “Gog, of the land of Magog.” From this tremendous attack Israel is rescued by fire from heaven, and Gog and his multitude suffer complete destruction. Lastly follows a picture of the restored temple and worship and of Israel dwelling safely in its own land. The closeness of the parallel leaves little room for doubt that these chapters of Ezekiel were before the writer of the Book of Revelation. Unfortunately, they shed little light on the passage before us. But that a national revival is depicted as a waking up of dead bones into life, is in complete harmony with the spiritual meaning given above to “the First Resurrection.”

The nearest and most instructive parallel is found in John v. 25–29, already expounded. For we have here two distinct resurrections, one present and spiritual, the other future and bodily, the one partial and the other universal. Similarly, in Ephesians ii. 5, 6, St. Paul speaks of some who were “dead” in consequence of their sins as already made alive and raised to sit with Christ in heavenly places. This teaching of St. Paul and of the Fourth Gospel contains all that is implied in the phraseology of Revelation xx. 4, 6.

For, certainly, those who have heard "the voice of the Son of God," and have thus "passed out of death into life," and whom God has "made alive with Christ" and "made to sit in the heavenly places in Christ" have experienced what may be called, in contrast to the final consummation, "the First Resurrection."

Of the binding of Satan for a long but limited time, to be again liberated for a short time, I can give no explanation fully satisfactory. But the binding must be a limitation, by supernatural power, of the activity of the great enemy of God and man. It follows the final overthrow of other hostile powers. But we have no indication that it will take place visibly before the eyes of men; or that it will interfere with the ordinary course of nature, as will the judgment described in verse 11. Still less have we proof that the binding of Satan will banish evil from the earth. Had this been so, for so long a time, he would not, on his return, have so quickly roused the nations to rebellion. The passage is most easily explained as announcing that the earlier victories of the Gospel will be followed by a removal, through an extraordinary manifestation of divine power, of the hindrances which the god of this world has been permitted to put in the way of its further progress.

The above exposition is all that is demanded and justified by the grammatical meaning of the words used in Revelation xx. 1-10. And it permits us to understand in its natural grammatical meaning the abundant and harmonious teaching of the rest of the New Testament. To some, it will seem to fall below the full meaning of the strong words used in the passage before us. But to these words we cannot give a stronger meaning without doing violence to much more abundant and plain teaching elsewhere.

If this exposition be correct, we may look upon the progress of the Gospel during the last eighteen centuries as a victorious war carried on by Christ against the powers of

evil which resist the advance of His kingdom ; and we may expect still further progress. We may expect that the great forces which still oppose the work of God will be broken, and that the power for evil of the great spiritual enemy will be conspicuously limited for a long period. During this long period of spiritual peace and progress on earth, they who in loyalty to Christ have laid down their lives, and all who after faithful service have passed away from earth, are living and reigning with Christ within the veil, enjoying already a life which is an anticipation of their final reward. Strange to say, this long period of peace and progress will be followed, in the mysterious purpose or permission of God, by a liberation of the evil powers which for a long time have been bound ; and by a consequent widespread revolt against God and His faithful ones. But this last uprising of evil will be short. The supernatural power which has already given to the Gospel its earlier victories will be again still more conspicuously put forth, and the power of evil be broken for ever. Then follows the great assize, the punishment of the wicked, and the New Earth and Heaven in which the saved will dwell with Christ.

From the above is evident that the writer of the Book of Revelation accepts to the full the harmonious teaching of the rest of the New Testament about the Second Coming of Christ and the end of the present order of things ; and adds to it an important element touching the progress of the kingdom of Christ before His return to judge the world.

In my next paper I shall discuss another interpretation of the difficult passage I have just endeavoured to expound, the interpretation underlying the doctrine commonly known as Millenarianism.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

ST. PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY.

XXI. THE LAST THINGS.

ON no subject, perhaps, was St. Paul, in his way of thinking, more a man of his time than on that of eschatology. And on no subject is it more difficult for one influenced by the modern spirit to sympathise with, or even to understand, the apostle. For modern modes of thought in this connection are very diverse from those of the Jews in the apostolic age. Not only our secular but even our religious interest centres largely in the present; theirs looked to the future. We desire to possess the *summum bonum*, salvation, life as it ought to be, here and now; for them it was something that was coming in the end of the days. And if we still believe in a final consummation, it is for us indefinitely remote, a goal so distant that we can leave it practically out of account, and conceive of the present order of things as going on, if not quite for ever, at least for a long series of ages. For the Jew, for St. Paul, the end was nigh, might come any day, probably would come within his own life-time. The last time, indeed, had already come; Christ himself, even at His first coming, was an eschatological phenomenon, and His second Advent could not be separated from His first by much more than a generation.

All this now seems so strange that the subject of the eschatology of the New Testament in general, and of St. Paul in particular, is apt to appear the reverse of inviting, a theme to be passed over in respectful silence. But in connection with an attempt to expound the Pauline system of thought such procedure is inadmissible. The prominence of the eschatological point of view in the Pauline letters forbids evasion of the topic simply because it may happen to be difficult or distasteful. For eschatology

in these letters does not mean merely the discussion of some curious, obscure, and more or less unimportant questions respecting the end of this world and the incoming of the next. It covers the whole ground of Christian hope. Salvation itself is eschatologically conceived. We had occasion to observe this fact in connection with the earliest of the Pauline Epistles, in which Christians are described as waiting for Christ from heaven ;¹ but the remark applies more or less to all the Epistles.²

Those who wait for a good greatly desired are naturally impatient of delay. Hence the second Advent, in the apostolic age, was expected very soon. The Apostle Paul expected it in his lifetime. To us now, this may appear surprising, not so much on account of the complete ignorance as to the future course of things the expectation implied, as by reason of the indifference it seems to show to the working out of the end for which Jesus Christ came into the world. How, we are inclined to ask, could a man who, like St. Paul, regarded the gospel as good news for the whole world, desire the speedy termination of the present order of things? Why not rather long and pray for ample time wherein to carry on missionary operations? In cherishing a contrary wish was he not preferring personal interests to the great public interest of the Kingdom of God? Surely it was desirable that all men should hear the good tidings! That end was not accomplished by preaching the gospel in a few of the principal centres of population in Asia and Europe. True, the faith might spread from town to country, and the evangelization of Corinth might be regarded as in germ the christianization of Greece. But that meant a process of gradual growth demanding time. And if time was not to be allowed for that process, was it really worth while contending so

¹ *Thess.* i. 10.

² *Vide* on this Kabisch, *Die Eschatologie des Paulus*, pp. 12-70.

zealously for the cause of Gentile Christianity? Why not let the Judaists have their way if the end was to be so soon? If the programme: a gospel of grace unfettered by legalism for the whole human race, was worth fighting for, surely its champion ought in consistency to wish for time to work it thoroughly out! The Jewish day of grace had lasted for millenniums; was the pittance of a single generation all that was to be thrown to Gentile dogs? To us it certainly seems as if the bias of St. Paul, as the advocate of Christian universalism, ought to have been decidedly in favour of a lengthened Christian era and an indefinitely delayed *παρουσία*; unless by the latter he meant Christ coming not to judge the world, but to resume the gracious work He had carried on in Palestine, adopting the larger world of heathenism as His sphere, and to quicken by His presence the energies of His servants, so that the process of converting the nations might go on at a tenfold speed.

A trace of the conception of a protracted Christian era may be discovered in the words of *Ephesians* iii. 21: "To Him be glory in the Church, and in Christ Jesus, unto all the generations of the age of the ages." But for critics this fact might simply be an additional argument against the authenticity of the Epistle. Turning to the Epistles more certainly Pauline, we find in two of them indications of a change of view to some extent in reference to the second coming. In *Philippians* the apostle represents himself as in a strait between two alternatives: one being to live on in this present world in spite of all discomfort for the benefit of fellow-Christians, the other to die (*ἀναλῦσαι*) and to be with Christ.¹ We see here the apostle's generous heart leaning to the side of postponement of the end. But the event to be postponed is not the second coming of Christ, but his own departure from this life. And the change in his mind does not consist in thinking that the

¹ *Phil.* i. 23.

Advent will not happen so soon as he had once expected, but rather in thinking that death will overtake himself before the great event arrives. He had hoped that Jesus would come during his lifetime. He cherishes that hope no longer, because the prospect before him is that his life will be cut short by an unfavourable judicial sentence. In *2 Corinthians* v. the same mood prevails, possibly for a different reason. "We know," writes the apostle, "that if the earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."¹ This is in a different key from those words in the first Epistle to the same church: "Behold I tell you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed."² In the earlier Epistle, written not long before, the apostle seems to hope to be alive when the Lord comes; in the later he writes like a man who expects to die, and who comforts himself by thoughts of the felicity awaiting him beyond the grave. Whence this altered mood within so brief an interval? It may be due to failure of the physical powers through sickness and hard conditions of existence, premonitory of dissolution at no distant date. The preceding chapter is full of hints at such a breaking down. The phrases "earthen vessels" (iv. 7), "the outward man wasting" (iv. 16), "the lightness of our present affliction" (iv. 17), are significant, implying bodily affliction by no means light, but *made* light by the buoyant spirit of the writer, and by the hope of the glory which awaits him when life's tragic drama is ended.

This change in the apostle's personal expectation was likely to have one consequence. It might lead him to reflect more than he had previously done on the state of the dead intermediate between the hour of death and the resurrection. As long as the second Advent was expected within his lifetime the intermediate state would not be a

¹ *2 Cor.* v. 1.

² *1 Cor.* xv. 51.

pressing question for him, and as far as appears he does not seem to have thought much about it. The phrase he uses in 1 *Thessalonians* to denote the dead is "those who sleep,"¹ a vague expression conveying no definite idea, or suggesting an idea analogous to that entertained by the ancient Hebrews, according to which the life of the departed was a shadowy, unreal thing compared with the life of those living on earth. In 2 *Corinthians* this vague phrase is replaced by much more definite language. The apostle expects at death to exchange the frail tabernacle of his mortal body for a permanent dwelling-place in heaven, and by this house from heaven he seems to mean a body not liable to corruption. It is to be put on as a garment (*ἐπενδύσασθαι*) fitting close to the soul. The word "naked" (*γυμνοὶ*) in v. 3 points in the same direction. The nakedness shrunk from is that of a disembodied spirit. The apostle does not wish to enter the world beyond as a bodiless ghost,—that seems to his imagination a cold, cheerless prospect—he simply desires to exchange the body that is mortal for a body that is endowed with the power of an endless life.

If this be the apostle's meaning, the question arises: how is this idea of a body in heaven to be put on at death to be reconciled with the doctrine of the resurrection? To what end a resurrection body if there is a body awaiting the deceased to be put on immediately after the corruptible one is put off? Or if the resurrection is to be held fast, is this body which the soul puts on as a new garment at death to be viewed as a temporary body, not an *οἰκητήριον*, or house, after all, but a tabernacle also, like the mortal body, only perchance of finer mould? This curious notion of a temporary body to be worn in the intermediate state has actually been resorted to by some interpreters, as a hy-

¹ 1 *Thess.* iv 13, 14.

pothesis wherewith to reconcile St. Paul's various statements about the future life. But it is a very questionable way of getting out of a difficulty. It is better to hold that the apostle had no clear light on the subject of the intermediate state, no dogma to teach, but was simply groping his way like the rest of us, and that what we are to find in *2 Corinthians* v. is not the expression of a definite opinion, far less the revelation of a truth to be received as an item in the creed as to the life beyond, but the utterance of a wish or hope. One cannot but note the contrast between the confident language of the first two verses and the hesitating tone of the next two. "We know," says the apostle in *v.* 1, "if being clothed we shall not be found naked"; "we wish not to be unclothed, but clothed upon," are the phrases he employs in *vv.* 3 and 4. It would seem as if in the first sentence of the chapter the writer's mind contemplated the future state as a whole without distinction between the pre-resurrection and the post-resurrection states, and that then the intermediate state occurring to his mind led to a change of tone.

Passing from this obscure topic to the more important subject of the resurrection, several grave questions present themselves for consideration, such as these: "Whom does the resurrection concern? What is the nature of the resurrection life, and of the resurrection body; and what the relation between the second Advent, the resurrection, and the final consummation or the end?"

1. As to the first of these questions, we are accustomed to take for granted that in the New Testament generally, and in the Epistles of St. Paul in particular, the resurrection of course concerns all men. To one whose mind is preoccupied with the belief in a general resurrection, both of the just and of the unjust, of believers and unbelievers alike, it seems easy to find traces of the doctrine in *1 Corinthians* xv. The words "as in Adam all die, even so in

Christ shall all be made alive,"¹ seem to express it plainly ; and the "end" spoken of in v. 24 is naturally taken to mean the end of the resurrection process, accomplished in three stages : Christ the firstfruits ; then those who belong to Christ rising at His second coming ; then, finally, after an interval, the resurrection of all the rest of the dead. But an imposing array of interpreters dispute this view of the apostle's meaning, restricting the "all" who are to be made alive in Christ to those who before their death were in living fellowship with Him, and seeing in the "end" not a reference to the concluding stage of the resurrection, but rather to the final stage of Christ's mediatorial work when He shall deliver up His Kingdom to the Father. It is conceivable of course that the apostle might have nothing to say on the subject of the general resurrection in a particular passage, while yet believing in it and even teaching it in other parts of his writings. But there are those who would have us believe that St. Paul knew nothing of a general resurrection, or of a life beyond for the ungodly and the unbelieving, and that his programme for the future was : life perpetual for all who believe in Jesus, for all the rest of mankind total extinction of being after death. It is even contended that the precise object of the Christian hope, according to St. Paul, was continuance of life, in the literal, physical sense, after death, and the privilege of the Christian, as compared with other men, that in his case this hope will be realised.²

To those accustomed to other ways of thinking these views are startling and disconcerting ; and apart altogether from the discomfort connected with the unsettling of preconceived opinions, it is disappointing to meet with so much diversity of view as to the interpretation of texts whose meaning had previously appeared so plain. But it is idle to

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 22.

² So Kabisch, in *Eschatologie des Paulus*.

indulge in querulous reflections. The wise course is to adjust ourselves to the situation, and to recognise once for all that the eschatological teaching of St. Paul is neither so simple nor so plain as we had imagined, and that the whole subject demands careful reconsideration. The result of a new study may, not improbably, be to convict such a discussion as that of Kabisch of the "vigour and rigour" characteristic of so many German theories. But it were well that that should appear as the conclusion of a serious enquiry rather than be assumed at the outset as an excuse for neglecting further examination. Meantime it is satisfactory to find that there is a large measure of agreement in regard to one fundamental point, viz., that St. Paul did earnestly believe and teach a resurrection of *Christians* to eternal life.

2. And yet there are those who seem not disinclined to call even this in question, or at least to rob the fact of abiding value for the Christian faith, by insisting on the *ethical* aspect of resurrection as opposed to the eschatological. The basis of this view is the manner in which St. Paul seems in various places to blend together the two aspects: the resurrection now experienced in the new life in the spirit, with the resurrection of the dead. Two instances of this may be cited. In *Romans* viii. 11 we read: "If the Spirit of Him who raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you"; and in *2 Corinthians* v. 5: "Now He that hath wrought us for this very thing is God (the thing referred to is investiture with the heavenly body), who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit." In these texts the apostle seems to found on the spiritual resurrection of the soul to a new divine life an argument in favour of a future physical resurrection to eternal life. It is a line of argument with which we are perfectly familiar, and of which all Christians feel the force in proportion to the vigour of their own

spiritual experience. But writers such as Pfleiderer and the late Mr. Matthew Arnold, acting as the mouthpieces of the modern spirit, find in these and kindred texts much more than this, even a new ethical way of thinking really incompatible with the old Jewish eschatological theory of the universe; co-existing indeed in St. Paul's mind with the latter, but destined eventually to supersede it. "The three essential terms of Pauline theology are not," writes Mr. Arnold in *Paul and Protestantism*, "calling, justification, sanctification. They are rather dying with Christ, resurrection from the dead, growing into Christ. The order in which these terms are placed indicates the true Pauline sense of the expression resurrection from the dead. In Paul's ideas the expression has no essential connection with physical death. It is true popular theology connects it with this almost exclusively, and regards any other use of it as purely figurative and secondary. . . . But whoever has carefully followed Paul's line of thought as we have endeavoured to trace it will see that in his mature theology, as the Epistle to the Romans exhibits it, it cannot be this physical and miraculous aspect of the resurrection which holds the first place in his mind, for under this aspect the resurrection does not fit in with the ideas he is developing."¹ Mr. Arnold does not mean to deny that St. Paul held the doctrine of a physical resurrection and a future life. He admits that if the apostle had been asked at any time of his life whether he held that doctrine he would have replied with entire conviction that he did. Nevertheless he thinks that that Jewish doctrine was only an outer skin which the new ethical system of thought was sooner or later to slough off.

"Below the surface-stream, shallow and light,
Of what we say we feel,—below the stream,
As light, of what we think we feel, there flows,
With noiseless currents strong, obscure and deep,
The central stream of what we feel indeed."

¹ p. 260.

The question thus raised is a momentous one, the full drift of which it is important to understand. It is nothing less than whether the eschatological point of view in general be really compatible with the ethical. If the question be decided in the negative, then all the eschatological ideas, resurrection, judgment, a future life with its alternative states, must be given up, or resolved into ethical equivalents; the resurrection into the new life in the spirit, the final judgment into the incessant action of the moral order of the world, and the eternal beyond into the eternal here which underlies the phenomenal life of men. On this theory the eschatological categories will have to be regarded as products of the religious imagination, just as the blue sky is the illusory product of our visual organs. The judgment will become the perpetually active moral order of the world projected forward in time by conscience, as the blue sky is the environing atmosphere projected by the eye to an indefinite distance in space. Heaven and Hell will be projections into the future of the rewards and punishments inseparable from right and wrong action falling within present human experience, and brought about by the natural operation of the law of cause and effect.

To these modern conceptions we may concede cogency so far as to admit that eschatological ideas require to undergo a process of purification in order to bring them into harmony with ethical views of human life and destiny. But it is an unfounded assertion that eschatological ideas in any form are incompatible with the ethical view point, to such an extent, *e.g.*, as to involve the denial of the future life altogether, which is by far the most important interest at stake. The hope of a life beyond in which the ideal to which the good devoted their lives here shall be realised seems to be a natural element in the creed of all theists. Nor does it appear incapable of being reconciled with the doctrine of evolution in the moral world, as even Bishop

Butler seems to have dimly preceived, for he endeavours to remove from the future state the aspect of arbitrariness, and to make it the natural outcome of the present life in accordance with the analogy of seed-time and harvest.

How time brings its revenges! Some years ago Mr. Arnold told us that St. Paul, without being aware of it, substituted an ethical for a physical resurrection, and an eternal life in the spirit here for an everlasting life hereafter. Now a German theologian tells us that St. Paul knows nothing of a figurative "life" ethical in quality, but only of a physical life; that prolongation of physical life after death is the object of his hope, that even the Spirit, in his system of thought, is physical and finely material, and communicates itself by physical means, by baptism, and even by generation through a Christian parent, that the germ of the resurrection body is a spiritual yet physical body, existing now within the dead carcase of the old body of sin, and that the essence of the resurrection will consist in the manifestation of this spiritual body by the sloughing off of its gross carnal envelope.¹ Such are the two extremes. Surely the truth lies somewhere between!

3. In comparison with the reality of the life hereafter the nature of the resurrection body and of its relation to the mortal body laid in the grave is a topic of subordinate interest, but a few sentences on it may not be out of place. The apostle broadly states that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.² From this it may be inferred that the resurrection body must differ greatly in nature from that worn in this present life. If we inquire further as to the positive character of that body, the only suggestion we can gather from the apostle's statements is that it will be composed of a light-like substance, so that it will shine like the heavenly bodies: though it is not perfectly certain that the

¹ Kabisch, *Eschatologie des Paulus*, zweiter Abschnitt, §§ 1 and 5.

² 1 Cor. xv. 50.

allusion to the latter in 1 *Corinthians* xv. 40, 41 is meant to serve any purpose beyond illustrating the difference between the natural body and the spiritual body. Yet it would not be surprising if St. Paul conceived of the spiritual body as a luminous substance, for it seems to have been a current opinion among the Jews that in the life to come the righteous would have shining bodies.¹ Too much stress, however, must not be laid on this, especially in view of the fact that more than one way of thinking seems to have prevailed in Rabbinical circles. According to Weber, there was a spiritualistic conception of life in the future world, as a life lacking all the characteristics of the present life: eating, drinking, generation, trade, and consisting in an eternal enjoyment of the glory of the Shekinah; and there was also a materialistic conception according to which eating and generation would continue, only the food would be exceptionally good, and the children all righteous.² It is difficult to decide how far such statements are to be taken seriously. The Jewish mind was realistic and sensuous in its way of thinking. Spirit was conceived of grossly and invested with some of the properties of matter. It was a kind of thin matter, an ether endowed with the properties of permanence, luminousness, and power to penetrate all things. So at least enquirers into these obscure regions tell us.³ If these views are to be taken literally, and if St. Paul is to be regarded as sharing them, the word "body" in the expression "a spiritual body" is superfluous. A spirit is a body, and a spiritual body is just a spirit.

What connection can a body of this kind have with the body which dies and is buried in the tomb? None at all, replies such a writer as Holsten, who goes the length of maintaining that even in the case of Christ, the post-resurrec-

¹ *Vide* Langen, *Judenthum in Palästina zur Zeit Christi*, p. 507.

² Weber, *Die Lehren des Talmud*, p. 383.

³ *Vide* Kabisch, *Die Eschatologie des Paulus*, pp. 188-228.

tion body stood in no relation to the crucified body, in the view of St. Paul; in other words, that the apostle did not think of the crucified body as rising again. This hypothesis hangs together with the dualistic interpretation of the Pauline doctrine of the flesh, according to which the flesh is radically sinful, Christ's flesh not excepted, and the atonement really consisted in the judicial punishment of sin in Christ's own body, which, as a criminal, was not worthy of the honour of being raised again. On this view the body in which Christ appeared to St. Paul on the way to Damascus must have been an entirely new creation. The construction thus put on the resurrection of Jesus, and on the resurrection generally, is not the one which an unbiassed consideration of the texts naturally suggests. The very words *ἐγείρω* and *ἀνάστασις* imply the contrary view, suggesting the idea of the resurrection body springing out of the mortal body as grain springs out of the seed sown in the ground. The analogy may not be pressed too far, but it contains this point at least, that the new will be related to the old so as to insure identity of form if not of substance, as the grain on the stalk is the same in kind, though not numerically the same, or composed of the same particles, as the seed out of which it springs.

4. Our last question is, is there any trace of chiliasm in the Pauline eschatology, any recognition of a period of time intervening between the second coming and the end when Christ shall resign the kingdom? An affirmative answer may plausibly be justified by a particular mode of interpreting 1 *Corinthians* xv. 22-28. Thus: there are three stages in the resurrection process; first Christ, then Christians, then the rest of mankind. With the third final stage coincides the "end." But between the second and the third stages there is an appreciable interval. This is implied in the term *τάγμα* involving the notion of succession, and also in the words *ἀπαρχή*, *ἔπειτα*, *εἶτα*, which

it is natural to regard as indicative each of a distinct epoch. We know that the first two stages are separated by a considerable interval, and it may be inferred that the second and third are likewise conceived of as divided by a long space of time. Another consideration in favour of this view is that on the contrary hypothesis Christ's reign over His Kingdom in glory would be reduced to a vanishing point. The argument has some show of reason, but the subject is obscure, and a modest interpreter must step cautiously and timidly, as one carrying but a glimmering torchlight to show him the way. Perhaps the apostle's thoughts were as represented, perhaps not; perhaps, like the prophets, he had himself but a dim, vague, shadowy conception of the future, very different from the future that is to be. The chapter on the resurrection in 1 *Corinthians* xv. is a sublime one, full of great thoughts and inspiring hopes. But beyond one or two leading statements, such as that affirming the certainty of the future life, I should be slow to summarize its contents in definite theological formulæ. I had rather read this chapter as a Christian man seeking religious edification and moral inspiration than as a theologian in quest of positive dogmatic teaching. The spirit of the whole is life-giving, but the letter is *δυσερμηνευτον*, and while some interpreters feel able on the basis of it to tell us all about the millennium, and others find therein a universal *ἁποκατάστασις*, when God shall be all in and to every human spirit, I prefer to confess my ignorance and remain silent.

A. B. BRUCE.

A CENTURY OF GERMAN THEOLOGY.

IF Ritschl can be said to have had a rival during the last dozen years, the man who deserved the title was probably Frank of Erlangen. His recent death is mourned by his disciples as premature; but his work was wonderfully

complete. He had finished his three great books—on Apologetics, Dogmatics and Ethics—each in two large volumes; and he had added to them, in the shape of a *Vade-mecum for Students of Divinity*, a kind of summing-up of his experience for the benefit of the younger generation, in which he appears to great advantage. But, it would seem, he was contemplating at least one book more—a History of Recent German Theology; and, although he did not live to complete this design, he lectured on the subject in three separate sessions and left behind a well-written manuscript. This has been published by his son-in-law under the title of *A History and a Criticism of Systematic Theology since Schleiermacher*.¹

The book suffers perhaps in some degree from the lack of the revision which the author himself would have given; here and there the thought is undeveloped, and there is a certain looseness in its entire structure more suitable to the class-room than to the study; but, on the other hand, there is, on this very account, a gain in interest and readableness. The author is talking about events of which he himself formed a part, and about personages with many of whom he was well acquainted; he indulges freely in personal details which only a contemporary could know; and he does not conceal his own likes and dislikes. The whole performance reveals a man of wide knowledge, strong convictions and, perhaps, some prejudices; but it is seasoned in every part with that shrewd and pithy wisdom which is the salt of literature.

The subject, as the title indicates, is German Theology since Schleiermacher; this, however, not only includes Schleiermacher, but a long introductory chapter on the influences by which he was formed. Here the author goes

¹ *Geschichte und Kritik der neueren Theologie, insbesondere der systematischen, seit Schleiermacher.* Von Fr. H. R. von Frank. Aus dem Nachlass des Verfassers herausgegeben von P. Schaarschmidt.

back as far as the Reformation, and ranges down, through the periods of Orthodoxy, Pietism and Rationalism, to Kant and the great philosophies. Naturally the treatment is sketchy, the remarks on the philosophical systems especially leaving much to be desired. Yet even here there are many good and striking things. Of Kant, for example, he makes the characteristic remark, "From his way of speaking about prayer it is manifest that he can never himself have cultivated the habit of prayer. So the intellectual heads and guides of the nation in that age. Yet these men were deified by their disciples, and set not only by the side of Christ but even above Him."

On reaching Schleiermacher, we plunge into the subject proper, and the treatment becomes much fuller and more satisfactory. In common with all intelligent Germans, Frank speaks of Schleiermacher with the utmost veneration, as not only the restorer of theology but one of the restorers of religion in his native land. He is alive, indeed, to the defects of Schleiermacher's system, and points them out in detail; but he contends that the truth which is contained in his writings is to be measured not with the fulness of the Gospel, but against the shallowness and spiritual poverty of the times in which he lived. His supreme merit was the place he gave to Christ, whose image he brought back into the centre of theology. He had also the great merit of inspiring minds which went much farther than his own in exploring the depths of experience and the Word. Curious it is to read here how a champion of orthodoxy like Claus Harms should have owed his conversion to Schleiermacher's *Addresses on Religion*. "It was a Saturday afternoon," he wrote in his Autobiography, "when I began to read. Soon I ordered the maid to say to anyone who might call that I was not at home. I read far into the night and finished it. Thereafter I may have slept a couple of hours, but on Sunday morning I began again at the beginning. Then

I felt in my head as if two screws were boring at my temples. At last I laid the book by, and went out to walk; and it was on this walk that on a sudden I recognised that all rationalism, all æsthetic, all self-knowing and all self-doing in the work of salvation are less than nothing, and it flashed on me like lightning that our salvation must come from Another. If to anyone this seems mysterious or mystic, and this story a myth or phantasm, so let it be; I cannot make it plainer, but I call that the birth-hour of my higher life; or, to speak more exactly, the death-hour of my old man, with his knowledge of divine things; or, to speak more clearly still, in the words in which Jung Stilling spoke of the impression made on him by Herder, I received from this book the impulse to a movement which shall never have an end." Frank's appreciation of Schleiermacher is easily intelligible when we remember how near akin is the "feeling" from which Schleiermacher deduced theology to the "experience" from which Frank derives it. His observations on the connection between the philosophy and the theology of Schleiermacher are particularly good.

After this point the author traces three lines of development.

First, there are the theologians belonging to what may be called the School of Schleiermacher, who developed his method and ideas, such as Twisten and Nitzsch, De Wette and Hase, Lange and Rothe. The truest representative of the school was, however, the Swiss Schweizer, of whom Frank gives a highly appreciative account, as he does also subsequently of the Swiss Biedermann. He is not so generous to others, such as Dorner, with whom he had closer personal relations. Indeed, it must be confessed, Frank supplies some illustration of the fact that the more distant in space a thinker of an opposite school is, the easier is it to do justice to his merits.

The second line of development proceeded from the great

German philosophical systems, especially that of Hegel, and included thinkers like Daub and Marheineke, Baur, Biedermann and Pfleiderer; but it ran aground in Strauss and Feuerbach. It is curious to read here that Hegelianism, which among us has still so vigorous a life, is in the land of its origin a thing of the past—a fact rather deplored by Frank, though he is anything but an Hegelian, because it has given place to a shallow and materialistic realism and empiricism. Though the theologians who endeavoured to express Christian truth in terms of Hegelianism were all influenced by Schleiermacher, the philosopher himself lived at war with the theologian, and a savage attack of his on the theology of “feeling” is here reproduced: “If religion is grounded in feeling, and this feeling is exclusively one of dependence, then the dog should be the best Christian, seeing he manifests this feeling in the highest degree. The dog has also feelings of redemption, when his hunger is relieved with a bone.”

Third in order is the theology which owed its origin to the revival of practical religion in the beginning of the century, after the power of Rationalism had been broken by the disciples of Schleiermacher and Hegel. Of this new school there were two wings—the less ecclesiastical, represented by men like Tholuck, Müller and Dorner; and the Lutheran, represented by Harless, Thomasius, Kahnis, Philippi and others. The author gives a warm and impressive account of the revival of religion, with which he is obviously in deep sympathy, and dwells with lingering fondness on its practical fruits in such forms as home and foreign missions and the institution of deaconesses. He holds strongly that the presence or absence of such fruits is the ultimate test not only of religious movements but of theological systems.

The Revival did not, however, produce the revolutionary effects which some expected from it; at least they were not

permanent. The enthusiasm of faith and hope subsided; the currents of overflowing life withdrew within the wonted channels; the theological ideas also, in their turn, became less warm and confident. The last period described by Frank is, in his eyes, one of reaction, and its chief feature is the growth of a New Rationalism, expressed in two forms—the Higher Criticism and the Ritschlian Theology.

On criticism he has not much to say, the subject of his book being confined to systematic theology. After quoting an eloquent passage of von Hofmann, in which it is said that “the Gospel is now enduring the nails of criticism, as the Lord endured the nails of His critical enemies, the scribes and Pharisees, but that it will rise again from the dead, as He did, not as a mere ghost, but with the same flesh and blood which were pierced and shed by its enemies,” he exclaims: “Alas! we are still in the *Via Dolorosa*, where the nails are being driven into the flesh of the Word of God.” Yet again and again he repeats the warning that orthodoxy has exposed the Church to peril by its delay in sifting out and appropriating those results of criticism which are undeniable.

If on criticism he is reticent, he speaks out with all the more fulness and decision on the Ritschlian theology, of which he has long been the foremost opponent. He begins with a connected account of Ritschl's system; and it would not be easy to find, in a brief space, a more intelligible statement of this great theologian's ideas. But sharp criticism follows the exposition. He complains of a profane, unchristian and arrogant tone in Ritschl's writings, and asserts that the entire school carries its condemnation on its face in the fact of its sterility in the region of practical Christian activity. He calls in question Ritschl's profession of hostility to metaphysics, arguing that at the basis of the system there lies a highly developed metaphysic, only an untrue and self-contradictory one.

The radical defect of the Ritschlian theology is the lack of a true and deep conception of sin. "The consciousness of sin, which was so prominent in Luther, and after him in the Protestant Church—the consciousness that man cannot draw near to a holy God without atonement—is unknown to Ritschl. To him it appears pietistic to make so much of the consciousness of sin. Only in that case Luther was a notorious pietist, and so was Paul." From this Frank deduces all the defects which he ascribes to Ritschl—his one-sided view of the character of God, his inadequate idea of atonement, his ignoring of conversion, and so forth. The followers of the great master, especially Harnack and Kaftan, are handled in the same drastic manner. In finishing his criticism of the former, he says that "his History of Dogma amounts to the annihilation not only of dogma but of the specifically Christian faith"; and, after describing Kaftan's well-known apologetic work, he concludes, "Oh for statistics of the actual results of such cheap and ineffectual argumentations! The offence and the foolishness of the cross are indeed set aside, but the wise of this world, for whose benefit this is done, are only moved to laughter and trample under foot the salt which has lost its savour." In passages like these it is easy to discern not only the heat of the combatant, but the prejudice of the partisan. Yet at a time when the Ritschlian school is taking possession of so many of the chairs in the German universities, the impressions of a critic on the spot of Frank's ability and earnestness are to outsiders of the utmost interest and significance.

The survey of the century, it will thus be seen, closes in a tone of depression. But the impression on the English reader is somewhat different. One cannot help feeling what a magnificent record is here presented of patient and continuous thought on the profoundest of all subjects carried on from generation to generation by men of every variety of gifts; no other nation has anything like it to show. And

surely the very existence of so many ways of construing the experience which has grown out of the facts and the words of revelation is itself a kind of proof that the Christian life is a reality, and not a dream.

JAMES STALKER.

THE AKHMÎM FRAGMENT AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

ST. JOHN differs from the synoptics with regard to the day of the crucifixion. In the Fourth Gospel it is the day before the passover. The Jews would not enter Pilate's judgment hall lest they should be defiled, "but that they might eat the passover," for "it was the preparation of the passover" (xviii. 28 and xix. 14). Many attempts have been made to explain away what appears to be the plain meaning of these and other passages, so as to bring the Fourth Gospel into harmony with the synoptic tradition which says that Jesus sat down to eat the passover with his disciples the night before He was crucified. But the Gospel of Peter says distinctly that it was "before the first day of unleavened bread, their feast" (*πρὸ μιᾶς τῶν ἀζύμων, τῆς ἑορτῆς αὐτῶν*) when Herod handed over the Lord to the people for crucifixion. Whether the writer of the Petrine fragment was following the Fourth Gospel or an independent tradition, this would be evidence in support of the literal acceptance of the words in John xviii. 28, xix. 14, etc.

Another point of controversy has been the method of naming the hours of the day in the Fourth Gospel. In the June number of the *Classical Review* Dr. Edwin Abbott gives some additional reasons for holding that the hours in the Fourth Gospel are the same as in the synoptics, namely, the twelve hours from sunrise to sunset. It may afford some further confirmation to the same view when we find the Petrine fragment, which shows some affinities with the Fourth Gospel,¹ clearly using the ordinary method of counting. It says that the darkness commenced at noon (*Ἦν δὲ μεσημβρία καὶ σκότος κατέσχε πᾶσαν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν*), and that it was found to be the ninth hour when it ended (*τότε ἥλιος ἔλαμψε καὶ εὐρέθη ὥρα ἐνάτη*).

J. A. CROSS.

¹ "For his chronology of the Passion-history the Petrine writer follows close in the steps of St. John."—Dr. Swete, p. xxv.

“*BOTH LORD AND CHRIST.*”

THE examination to which modern criticism has in recent years submitted the writings of the Old Testament, as literature, has brought into prominence some questions concerning the manner in which these older Scriptures are used in the New Testament. There has been discussed, among other matters, the way in which the names of authors are given to some of the books, notably the Psalter and the Law. In what sense, it is asked, do Christ and His Apostles assign the first five books to Moses and the Psalter to David? Is their language to be accepted as a direct assertion that the works so assigned were verily written by David and Moses? Or are they merely using the titles which tradition and popular judgment had given to the books? With regard to the books named “of Moses” most men are now agreed that, while they contain matter which had its origin with Moses, their present form is due to later hands. The case of the Psalter presents more difficulty. And in connexion with that part of the enquiry, men’s minds have been specially exercised by Christ’s application, as it is reported in the Gospels, of some words from Psalm cx. Moreover, out of the discussion of our Lord’s language, on the occasion referred to, an enquiry has arisen concerning the nature and limitation of His human knowledge.

Now, that God does condescend to limit Himself, we know. For He has bestowed on each one of us freedom of will. He sets before us life and death, good and evil, but He puts no constraint upon our choice, to compel us to

His law. And, as has been well said,¹ "Divine truth becomes many times in Scripture incarnate, debasing itself to assume our rude conceptions, that so it may converse more freely with us, and infuse its own divinity into us." There will therefore be no irreverence if we speak of our Lord's human knowledge as willingly limited: if we conceive Him to have assumed, for a time, and for the purposes of His grace, the level of those whom He addressed. His love is our warrant for believing that, while He would teach nothing but what was true, He would yet frame His speech in such wise that His hearers should fully comprehend His meaning. According to the Jewish dictum,² "The law speaks with the tongue of the children of men," employing anthropomorphic terms in reference to God Himself, because in no other way could the Infinite be at all revealed to the finite capacities of mankind. And if this be true of the Law, how much more true may we believe it to be of Him who came to fulfil the Law!

With this thought in mind let us look first at the words which Christ has quoted from the Psalm in question: then consider His manner of using them, and the purpose which He had at heart, and note at the same time the effect which they produced on the Pharisees to whom He was speaking. The last appears to be the most likely path in which to seek some solution of the difficulties which have been raised respecting the Gospel narratives.

The language of the Psalm is of the most lofty and solemn character. The writer, whether he be David or another, is full of a heaven-sent message, "The oracle of Jehovah unto my lord" forms his unique preface. We find no parallel to this elsewhere in Scripture. Thus introduced, the prophecy is stamped with a special importance. Now, who is intended by *אֲדֹנָי* my lord? It is a

¹ *Select Discourses of John Smith*, p. 173.

² Talm. Babli. Jebamoth, 71a.

form of address applicable, and often applied,¹ to merely human dignitaries, as is also the Greek *κύριος*,² by which it is translated in the Septuagint and in the New Testament. The possibility of such an application should be kept in mind, for it may help us to a fuller interpretation of this important verse.

But the august person to whom the oracle of the Psalmist is addressed is one in whose destiny and triumph God Himself is intimately concerned: one who, while He may be spoken of by a title such as other men bear, is marked, by the message of Jehovah, as something more than man, as about to be highly exalted, to be raised to such a dignity, that while He sits on the throne of Heaven, the Almighty Father will undertake for Him, and bring all His foes into subjection.

And here it should be observed that it forms no part of the revelation of this divine oracle in Psalm cx., that the exalted person with whom it is concerned is to be the son of David. Nor does the language depend for any of its force on being the utterance of David. The glorious words which the Psalmist publishes would bear the same import whether they were delivered to the world "by the hand of" David, or of Haggai, or Zechariah, or any other divinely commissioned herald. He who is here called "lord" would be lord alike to all "the goodly fellowship of the prophets."

Nor is the Psalm a description of some earthly triumph, meant to be further interpreted as prefiguring a grander spiritual conquest. We are carried by it at once into the heart of a spiritual warfare. Jehovah hath put on His apparel and girded Himself with strength. We may not interpret as if a primary reference were made to some potentate of the Psalmist's day, while the words are to be

¹ Cf. Gen. xxiii. 6, 11, 15; xxxiii. 13, 14; 1 Sam. xxii. 12; xxiv. 8.

² Cf. John iv. 11; xii. 21.

applied in a loftier sense to the Messiah. To no mere human ruler could such exaltation be offered. Still less could such a one be spoken of as raised to an eternal priesthood. The language fits Him alone, in whom the Father was well pleased, His own, His only Son, in whom the Divine and human were hereafter to be united, and to whom alone both the human title and the heavenly exaltation could belong.

Hence the Psalm stands alone¹ among the Messianic prophecies. Other predictions of the Christ bear a meaning and a direct lesson for the times in which they were uttered. Here the voice of Jehovah brings from the council-chamber of heaven a message, the key to which can only be found when He appears, who wears the two-fold nature mysteriously implied in the solemn words. And commentators² have been constrained to acknowledge that for this sublime Psalm no double application is possible. Once, and only once, has humanity been united with divinity.

When we turn to examine the account of our Lord's interview with the Pharisees, during which He made reference to this Psalm, we find some variations in the narratives³ of the Synoptists, by whom alone it is recorded. And it is only from St. Matthew that we learn the effect produced by Christ's questioning. "No one was able to answer Him a word, nor durst any one from that day question Him any longer." It is St. Matthew too who gives us a report of what occurred in the direct form, recording the questions just as they were put to the Pharisees gathered around Him. And it is not unimpor-

¹ This uniqueness is marked in the New Testament too, where no Scripture is so frequently quoted. Beside the citations in the Gospels, parts of it are quoted in Acts ii. 34; 1 Cor. xv. 25; Heb. i. 13 v. 6; vi. 20; vii. 17, 21; 1. Pet. iii. 22

² See Perowne on Ps. cx.

³ Matt. xxii. 41-46; Mark xii. 35-37; Luke xx. 41-44.

tant to notice that in this direct account our Lord's language is all in the form of questions. He makes no formal statement, but wishes by interrogation, if it may be, to lead them upward unto truth. He begins, "What think ye of the Christ? Whose Son is He?" Had they answered the first of these questions, their reply would doubtless have expressed their expectation of a purely human descendant of David, who should be pointed out by the unction¹ of Elijah, as the adopted of God, and thus be constituted the Messiah. But they only respond to the second. "They say unto Him: The son of David." But it was a human son of David that satisfied all their aspirations. The whole race, as was seen even in the disciples who had been so long with Jesus, was looking for one to sit upon an earthly throne, and restore the kingdom to Israel.

The words of the other Evangelists make clear for us the point towards which the questions of Jesus were tending. "How say they (the scribes, *Mk.*) that the Christ is the Son of David? In what sense do they understand this sonship? Shall the Christ be sprung from David's line even as Solomon was, and be in nothing greater than he? The 'How' makes clear for us the drift of St. Matthew's 'What think ye?' which the Pharisees had refrained from answering. Jesus would fain correct the error in which the scribes, in common with nearly all the nation, had become confirmed. They had grown blind to the meaning of one-half of the Divine revelation, and looked for the promised Messiah to be a mere human leader. Human indeed, the seed of the woman, their Scriptures promised from the first page that He should be; human, that He might sympathise with mankind: but the same Scriptures proclaimed Him as one who could be acknowledged as the very Son of God. This is the lesson which our Lord endeavours to make them read for themselves.

¹ Cf. Justin, *Dialogue*, c. 8.

And in this wise does He bring them to their lesson-book. "How then does David in spirit call Him lord: saying, The Lord said unto my lord, Sit thou on my right hand until I put thine enemies beneath thy feet? If then David call Him lord, how is He his son?" In St. Luke the quotation is prefaced thus: "David himself saith in the book of Psalms," and by St. Mark it is introduced still more solemnly, "David himself said by the Holy Ghost."

At this point of the narrative there are several matters which call for notice. It is here, and here only, by our Lord's employment of Psalm cx., that the Messiah's sonship to David is placed in close connexion with the lordship mentioned in the Psalm. But it is of set purpose that these two terms of relationship are set side by side. The Pharisees had admitted that the Christ would be David's son. For this they had God's promise to the king himself, and the confirmation thereof in the prophetic message of Isaiah (xi. 1). But they had halted in their reading of the Divine promises. So to bring them to a true conception, Christ points them to this other Scripture, which they held to have reference to the Messiah, and which, if rightly understood, would rid them of their misconception. In doing this, He does not intend to institute any contrast between the sonship and the lordship. The titles are co-ordinate. Both have reference to the human nature of the Messiah. But in the Psalm there is an addition. The Divine aspect of the Christ there is linked with the title which will belong to Him as Man. The lordship, the designation of a human dignity, is ascribed to One whom Jehovah will call to His own right hand. This union of the divine and human is the profound message of the Psalmist's revelation. This an oracle from Jehovah could alone disclose.

And it is noteworthy that in Christ's question the Divine and the human attributes are kept in immediate conjunc-

tion. Jesus does not break up the sentence: "The Lord said unto my lord, Sit thou on my right hand," but gives it as the picture of God's complete purpose that in the Messiah the two natures will be combined. It was not needful for Him to repeat the whole verse, when he asked the question the second time. "David himself calls Him lord," he says, in the manner in which you have heard, joining to that title words which proclaim his heavenly exaltation; "how then is He his son?" How may a son of David, who can be addressed as human dignitaries are, be also One whom God can raise to His own throne, and appoint Him to be an eternal High Priest?

Into this do the questionings of Jesus resolve themselves. He accepts the answer that the Christ will be the Son of David. It was truth, but only a part of the truth. In the Psalm there had stood written for generations a foretoking of the great mystery of God manifest in the flesh. To this the eyes of the Pharisees were closed. Out of their own mouths, by His interrogations, Jesus would fain draw a loftier and truer confession than was contained in their first answer. Is it alien to the spirit of His teaching to think that, for giving such a lesson, He would condescend to place Himself for a moment on the level of those whom He desired to instruct? He, whose whole life was stooping to lift up the fallen? Need it seem strange to us that He calls the Psalter by the name of David, as did all those who were listening to Him. It was but for a moment. The sentence is not closed before He applies the corrective. "David said by the Holy Ghost." A greater than David is here. Questions concerning the limitation of our Lord's human knowledge may be dismissed from our minds. On the words of the Psalm He bestows the noblest title to acceptance. The true author is the Divine Spirit. It is direct from the eternal presence-chamber that the oracle comes concerning that Son, through whom God was

about to speak to the world in the last days, and who, when He had by Himself purged our sins, was to be enthroned at the right hand of the Majesty on high.

The Pharisees felt, it may be dimly, but they felt, whither Christ's questions were leading. And for the time they were afraid of what they felt, and durst ask Him no more questions. For as He came to reveal the Father, so, in words like these, He was the Revealer of Himself. But though He had come to bring this light to His own, they received Him not. The Psalm, however, as thus expounded by the Master, has been much employed by His messengers in the New Testament as containing in itself a proclamation of the Divine and human in the nature of our blessed Lord. The apostle to the Hebrews thus interprets it. Jesus who on the human side took hold upon the seed of Abraham was He to whom God said "Sit thou on My right hand." And St. Peter (Acts ii. 26) takes it for the text of his sermon on the day of Pentecost, declaring that in it God had shown that the Jesus whom the Jews had crucified, was Divine as well as human, was made both Lord and Christ: a Lord whom men may acknowledge and pay him their allegiance, and the Christ, the beloved Son of God.

Jesus had been inviting His generation, both by words and works, to accept¹ this mystery. In His miracles the disciples beheld His glory, and believed on Him. They found that His words were the words of eternal life. Not so the Pharisees. The eyes of this people were blinded, their ears they had stopped. And they had grown to be boastful of their blindness. "Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on Him?" was their question (John vii. 48) to the officers who reported "Never man spake like

¹ It was accepted, as Christ would have it accepted, by St. Thomas (John xx. 28) when he acknowledged the Jesus, whom he had long called Lord, to be also verily God. "My Lord and my God."

this Man." But the words which Jesus had spoken were remembered against Him. And we can understand, from what subsequently happened, why He attempted no more at first than to guide them to the truth by questionings. His hour was not yet come. A time, however, arrived ere long when He was asked in set terms (Mark xiv. 62), "Art thou the Christ, the son of the Blessed?" And He answered, "I am."

This answer they must have expected, nay they probably courted it, because of the opposition which, among men like-minded with themselves, it was sure to evoke. The high-priest rent his clothes. The language of Jesus he declared to be blasphemy. And the popular voice was with him. They all condemned Jesus to be worthy of death. He had expounded to them now, no longer by questions, but plainly, the doctrine of the Psalm: "Ye shall see the Son of Man, sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven." Aforetime they had tried to stone Him (John x. 33) for this teaching. "Because that thou being a man makest thyself God." In the end they crucified Him. And it was a heathen centurion, and not a Jew, who at the crucifixion saw and declared the truth, published of old in the oracle of Jehovah: "Truly this *man* was the son of God" (Mark xv. 39).

J. RAWSON LUMBY.

ISAIAH'S ANTICIPATIONS OF THE FUTURE.

SOME RECENT THEORIES.

FEW Old Testament writings owe more to the combined results of criticism and archæology than the book of Isaiah. The task of distinguishing in this very composite whole the real work of Isaiah ben Amoz has now been approximately accomplished; and it is fast becoming generally admitted that the writings of the great prophet of the eighth century do not extend beyond the following chapters: i.-xi., xiv. 24-xx., xxi. 11-xxiii., xxviii.-xxxii.¹ More recent investigators have therefore been the freer to pay attention to the discovery of glosses or interpolations within this Isaianic kernel; several apparent instances are discussed in Duhm's commentary, published two years since, and in the dissertations, to be discussed below, of Giesebrecht and Hackmann. The presence, to some extent, of such intrusive matter in the prophetic writings is proved beyond doubt by the evidence of the LXX., and by the Aramaic verse at Jeremiah x. 11; the exegete therefore should give due weight to the possibility of the confusion and inconsequence of thought which at present prevails in many prophetic passages being due to textual expansion, just as the grammarian is bound to consider the possibility of an anomalous form or construction being due to textual corruption.

But if criticism, by separating alien passages from the writings of Isaiah with which they had become interwoven, has contributed much and promises to contribute more to a correct knowledge of Isaiah's own ideas, archæology has, by determining the chronology of the prophecies, done

¹ The most important section, besides those mentioned above, still claimed by many as Isaianic is chap. xxxiii.; indeed the weight of English criticism would still seem to regard this chapter as Isaiah's; cf. Driver, *Introduction*, p. 213; G. A. Smith, *The Book of Isaiah*, pp. 331 ff.; Kirkpatrick, *Doctrine of the Prophets*, pp. 199, 200; Robertson Smith, *Prophecy* (1882), p. 421. Otherwise Cheyne, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, iv. 569.

much to make it possible to trace the development of these ideas. Here again a welcome addition of knowledge might result from further discoveries; meantime criticism does well to make the most of what fixed points we have. Chief among these, for our present purpose, is the determination of the "death year of King Uzziah." This we now know from the Assyrian inscriptions did not fall earlier than 740; nor can it have been much later. From this it follows that the Syro-Ephraimitish war broke out somewhat less than five years, instead of, as was formally supposed, somewhat more than twenty years after the prophet's call. Hence from Isaiah viii. 3¹ we deduce that Isaiah's eldest son, Shear-Jashub, must have been born at the time of, or very shortly after, the call. But this son was one of the children given Isaiah "for signs and wonders in Israel" (viii. 18); and an examination of the name shows that it expresses one of Isaiah's characteristic doctrines—a remnant shall return. The date of the child's birth, moreover, proves that this doctrine was not one at which the prophet slowly arrived—deriving it, like Hosea, as an emotional corollary from a belief in Jehovah's love of Israel—but one from which the prophet started. On this point, then, that Isaiah from the first had a doctrine of the Remnant and that in one way or other this doctrine was normative with him, there is agreement. It is when we come to ask what was the nature of the remnant he believed in, how his earlier conceptions stood related to his later, and in what way any change which took place was due to the political developments of the time, that we find disagreement among recent writers on the subject.

The latest and fullest treatment comes from Dr. Hackmann, *Privatdocent* at Göttingen, and is contained in his book published last year entitled, *Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaia*. Although to many some of his arguments

¹ Cf. Driver, *Isaiah*, p. 1.

might appear too *à priori*, his discussion is so careful and suggestive that some exposition of it, especially in its bearing on certain exegetical problems, may be of interest to students of Biblical Theology and Exegesis.

But his book, standing, as it does, at the end of a series of discussions on the same subject, can only be estimated aright in the light of these. A brief *résumé* of the more important of such earlier discussions may make this clear.

It is now all but twenty years since Duhm published his important work on the Theology of the Prophets; in it he devoted a special section (pp. 158-168) to the discussion of Isaiah's prophecies of the Future. His conclusions were as follows: From the beginning Isaiah looked forward to a definite catastrophe which at first he conceived as affecting only Israel and Judah. Afterwards he extends this area of judgment and gradually includes the surrounding nations, together with Egypt, ultimately also Assyria. This judgment is to be complete that it may replace the present corrupt by a completely new epoch. This gradually increasing conception of Judgment is accompanied by gradually enlarging Hopes. The severer the Judgment, the more glorious the Future that lies beyond it. Duhm finds Isaiah's originality to consist in the idea that the promised Future will be essentially characterised not by a mere fortunate turn in circumstances but by a complete change in all the relations of life.

According to Guthe,¹ Isaiah had two distinct views of the Future; the one characterises the earlier, the other the later prophecies. In common with his predecessors, Amos and Hosea, Isaiah saw that Assyria must sooner or later bear down on his own and the surrounding countries, and that it would then prove too strong for them. At the same time, being possessed of a deeper view of Jehovah's character than then prevailed, he saw in the present state

¹ In his inaugural lecture, *Das Zukunftsbild des Jesaja* (Leipzig, 1885).

of Judah a neglect of Jehovah's holiest requirements, which could only be sufficiently punished by direst national calamities. In Isaiah's earliest prophecies we therefore find a dark view of the Future: Judah and Israel, save for a small remnant, are utterly to perish; Ahaz, the present worthless representative of David, is to be replaced, after a somewhat lengthened period of severe distress, by another descendant of David of ideal character.

But events proved less disastrous than Isaiah had anticipated; and although this could not change his fundamental conviction of the need for a purifying judgment, it did effect a change in his conception of the Future. The later prophecies are therefore characterized by the belief in the Invincibility of Zion, and the absence of the conception of the Messianic King. Distress is still anticipated, but its duration is to be brief (x. 25; xxix. 17).

The abandonment of the earlier conception, which took place between 724 and 701, is justified by the prophet in the parable of the husbandman's different modes of cultivation (xxviii. 23-29). From the retention of the passages respecting the future ideal Davidic ruler in Isaiah's collected prophecies, Guthe argues that subsequently to 701, finding that the great deliverance of that year did not produce the age of moral regeneration, the prophet so far returned to his earlier conception as to see again that the actual reigning king would be unworthy of the expected Future. In a sense, therefore, Guthe may be said to attribute *three* different views to Isaiah.

This Giesebrecht¹ certainly does, and finds all three in the extant prophecies; he refers them severally to the three great political crises of Isaiah's lifetime. During the Syro-Ephraimitish war the prophet expected the complete destruction of Judah, in the last days of Samaria the preservation of Judah, at the time of Sennacherib's campaign

¹ *Vide Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik* (Göttingen, 1890); see esp. pp. 76-84.

(701) the preservation of a remnant, but the destruction of the main part of Judah. These changes moreover, according to Giesebrecht, were sudden, and so corresponded to the "choleric nature of the prophet."

Duhm, then, so interprets the prophecies as to attribute to Isaiah a gradual development in his doctrine of the Future: at the last, as at the first, it remains essentially the same, only it grows in course of time more far-reaching both as regards judgment and the subsequent glory. Guthe and Giesebrecht, on the other hand, agree in postulating for Isaiah a complete change of doctrine: they also agree in supposing that neither his earliest nor his latest anticipations were the most hopeful. Hackmann, like Duhm, finds a gradual development of doctrine; but, unlike Duhm, and by no means in full agreement with either Guthe or Giesebrecht, he finds this development characterized by increasing anticipations of disaster and diminishing hopes of deliverance. The prophet's hopes are at a maximum in his earliest, at a minimum in his latest writings. More in detail the history of Isaiah's Doctrine of the Future is, according to Hackmann, as follows.

It was, in the first instance, against Ephraim that Isaiah felt himself called to prophesy. Ephraim was irremediably corrupt and ripe for judgment; Judah might still be saved by learning from Ephraim's doom and returning to God. The first of these two thoughts dominates the narrative of the vision (chap. vi.); the second finds expression in the name—Shear-Jashub—given at about the same time to Isaiah's son. Tacitly, indeed, this name implies the first thought also; for a remnant implies a whole, and a remnant that returns a greater part that does not return. The whole is Ephraim and Judah (for the idea of national unity survived the disruption of the monarchy) and the part that does not return¹ is Ephraim.

¹ The contrast to the name שָׂרָא יְשׁוּבָא—a remnant (*i.e.*, Judah) shall return—

Such was Isaiah's doctrine before the Syro-Ephraimitish war; and the first change it underwent was only due to the attitude of Judah during this war. The people failed to catch the inspiration of Isaiah's own faith in Jehovah. On the other hand, overtures were made to Assyria, and Judah thus came to share Ephraim's disloyalty to Jehovah. Perceiving this, Isaiah recognised that Judah would not "return," and that it too must suffer punishment. It is true, he did not in consequence wholly abandon his doctrine of the remnant; but the remnant is now no longer all Judah, but only the prophet's immediate followers (cf. viii. 5-8, 11-15).

Between the conclusion of the war and the invasion of Sennacherib few prophecies now extant were delivered. The brief utterance in xxviii. 1-4 shows that the continued existence of Samaria after 732 did not diminish the prophet's conviction of its doom;¹ and chap. xx., dating from 711, that then also Isaiah anticipated only disaster from reliance on Egypt. In this interval, however, the fall of Samaria justified his judgment that Ephraim was irrevocably doomed. The question now arose afresh—What was to be the future of Judah? As early as 733 Isaiah had, as has been stated, abandoned the hope that all Judah would "return"; and, although, during the early part of Hezekiah's reign, the prophet may have given less frequent utterance to his conviction of coming judgment, yet he never wavered in it, and the subsequent attitude of Hezekiah and his princes only served to deepen it.

Even the great deliverance of 701, unexpected alike by Isaiah and the people, did not lead the latter to stay them-

comes out forcibly on the above theory in vi. 10: The people are to be hardened "lest they see with their eyes . . . and return" (כֹּחַ), *i.e.* Ephraim shall *not* return.

¹ A fact that does not favour Guthe's theory that it was the continued existence of Jerusalem after Isaiah had anticipated its fall that gave rise to his belief in the invincibility of Zion.

selves on Jehovah; on the contrary, they gave themselves up to wanton merriment (xxii. 2 ff.). The state of Judah was thus finally and conclusively shown to be what that of Ephraim had been thirty years before, and the prophet's last forecast for Judah thus becomes: "Surely this iniquity shall not be purged from you till ye die" (xxii. 14).

In brief, Isaiah, according to Hackmann, started with a view of the Future which involved the destruction of Ephraim, but the possible preservation of Judah, and finally came to a view which involved the certain destruction of Judah also.

The theory in its entirety rests on two main positions: (1) That before and during the earlier part of the Syro-Ephraimitish war Isaiah's prophecies were directed against Ephraim, not Judah; (2) that the references in the later prophecies to the invincibility of Zion are non-Isaianic. These two positions can be best considered separately on their own merits. The one does not stand or fall with the other.

The early prophecies (before 732), according to Hackmann, who here substantially agrees in every positive respect with all modern critics, are i. 2-31, ii. 6-iv. 1, v.-viii. 18, ix. 8-21, xvii. 1-11. These he dates more precisely thus: ¹ ix. 8-21, x. 4b, v. 25b-30—before the Syro-Ephraimitish alliance; xvii. 1-11, (i. 18-20)²—after the alliance but before the war; vii.-viii. 4—in immediate prospect of the attack on Jerusalem; viii. 5-18 (i. 21-31)—later in the course of the

¹ The connection between ix. 8-x. 4 and v. was already observed by Ewald. Giesebrecht and Hackmann have independently reached almost identical reconstructions. Thus ix. 8-21, x. 4, v. 25b (=x. 4b)-30 go together, being characterized by the refrain, "For all this His anger is not turned away," etc.; again, v. 1-25a, x. 1-3 were originally united, the whole being characterized by its several sections beginning with "Woe." (References in chap. ix. according to the English enumeration.)

² The dates of the bracketed passages are determined in part by the theory, which is based in the first instance on the prophecies the dates of which can be more decisively determined.

war; (i. 2-17) also during the war; (ii. 6-iv. 1, v. 1-24) after the war. Chap. vi., at whatever time written, refers to the opening of the prophet's career. Now of the two prophecies certainly dating from before the war one (xvii. 1-11) is entirely concerned with the fate of Ephraim—Ephraim's doom is fixed; in the other, Judah is incidentally alluded to (ix. 21), but ver. 9 shows that the N. kingdom is the real subject of the prophecy, the purport of which agrees with that of xvii. 1-11. Before the war, therefore, Isaiah's theme was the speedy destruction of Ephraim.

Of his attitude towards Judah we first have evidence when Jerusalem was threatened by the allied forces; what we conceive that attitude to have been depends on our interpretation of chap. vii.—especially of the much-vexed passage contained in vers. 10-17. It is here that Hackmann comes forward with fresh and interesting suggestions. Like Duhm (in his commentary) he omits vers. 15 and 17 as later interpolations,¹ and in a passage which, if it is to be interpreted at all, demands, as the best scholars candidly admit, assumptions of one kind or another—if not critical, then exegetical—it would be unwise to dismiss a theory merely because it assumes that certain verses have been interpolated. For, granted this assumption, others that must else be made can be dispensed with. Omitting the verses in question, chap. vii. may be summarized thus: Isaiah goes to Ahaz to inspire him with his own conviction that Judah is safe because Ephraim is doomed; Ahaz declines to ask for a sign in proof of this; but that he may be left without excuse for unbelief, Jehovah gives the sign² unasked, the prophet announcing it thus: Any

¹ No merely arbitrary proceeding to justify a theory. The custom by which the reason for a name immediately follows a name (cf. *e.g.* viii. 3, 4) renders ver. 15 suspicious; and the remarkable "abruptness of the transition" in ver. 17 was long ago noticed by Prof. Cheyne in his commentary.

² Hackmann thus considers that the sign actually given was intended to prove precisely what the sign Ahaz was requested to demand would have proved,

maiden¹ now conceiving, when she bears her son may call his name "With us (viz. Judah) is God"; for before the child in question shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good the land (Syria and Ephraim) whose two kings thou abhorrest shall be forsaken (vii. 14-16). Then immediately follows in detail the description of desolated *Ephraim* (vers. 18-25). Thus, in chap. vii., as also in viii. 1-4, Isaiah's conviction of the approaching fall of the N. kingdom recurs; but, as yet, his expectation seems to be that Judah will take warning from Ephraim's fate, "return," and be saved. It is not till somewhat later that, convinced by the stern logic of facts—the actual appeal of Ahaz to Assyria, he abandons his hopeful tone, and for the first time definitely threatens Judah: Judah, he now declares, for having shared in Ephraim's sin of diplomacy, which from the prophetic standpoint is disloyalty to Jehovah, will share Ephraim's doom—the Assyrian flood will overflow from Ephraim into Judah (viii. 5-8). This changed standpoint appears also in vers. 11 ff., and in vers. 16-18 we see developing the new idea of the remnant as a party within Judah.

viz. Judah's safety, Ephraim's impotence; whereas, according to prevailing theories, Ahaz was *offered* a sign of Judah's safety, and, for refusing, was *given* a sign of Judah's ruin; such theories find greater support for this change than Hackmann seems inclined to admit, for ver. 9b certainly implies that the promise to Judah was conditional. The real questions at issue are therefore: Was it just the refusal of Ahaz to ask for a sign that filled up the cup of Judah's unbelief? Is the sign in ver. 14 most naturally interpreted as a promise or a threat?

¹ There is of course nothing new in regarding the article in העלמה (vii. 14) as generic, and so translating *any* maiden (cf. R. Smith, *Prophets*, pp. 272, 425). But if we thus determine to regard Immanuel as the name of any ordinary child, we must—to avoid the strong objection urged against this interpretation by Dr. Driver (*Isaiah*, p. 41)—read with Duhm in viii. 8, ארץ כי עמואל ("the land; for God is with us" instead of "Thy land, O Immanuel") regarding ארץ כי עמואל here and in ver. 10 as a gloss. The other objection generally raised against the above interpretation seems to me to possess little weight, and to rest mainly on a misapprehension of what a sign might be (cf. viii. 4, 18, 1 Sam. ii. 34, Exod. iii. 12—"token" (R.V.) same word as "sign" in Is. vii. 14). On this point Prof. Bevan has recently called attention to some very pertinent Arabic parallels—*v. Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. vi. (Oct., 1893), pp. 220-222

If this interpretation of the earlier prophecies be correct, chaps. ii., iii., v. naturally fall after the war; once convinced that Judah also was doomed to punishment, the prophet's eye became keener to observe the social abuses abounding in his own country; Ephraim does not cease to be the object of his denunciation—in chap. ii. it is chiefly referred to—but Judah is now also denounced either in common with Ephraim as in chap. ii., or by itself as in chaps. iii. and v.

The supposition that Ephraim is the subject of Isaiah's early prophecies throws fresh light also on the problem presented by the narrative of the call (chap. vi.). The prevailing gloom of the message there entrusted to the prophet, which is not greatly relieved by the ray of hope apparently found at the end of ver. 13, presents a striking contrast to the hopeful message with which Isaiah came to Ahaz (chap. vii.). The assumption, therefore, which has hitherto been general, that Judah is the object of the message in chap. vi., and also of the message in chap. vii. presents a serious difficulty, to explain which several theories have been suggested, the favourite one¹ being that chap. vi. was not actually written till many years after the call, and that the forebodings of those later years, occasioned by the obstinacy and lack of faith shown by Ahaz, have given to the narrative a darker colouring than it would otherwise have had. Hackmann can dispense with this and similar theories, for his view is that Ephraim and Ephraim only is referred to in chap. vi.; in favour of this it can be urged:—

(1) That the (apparently) earliest prophecies of Isaiah (ix. 8–21, xvii. 1–11) are exclusively concerned with Ephraim, with the circumstances of which they show an accurate acquaintance;

(2) That these prophecies betray the same judgment of Ephraim which, on the hypothesis, is found in chap. vi.,

¹ Cf. Ewald, *Propheten*, i. 321 ff.; Cheyne, *Prophecies of Isaiah*, i. 36 f.; G. A. Smith, *Book of Isaiah*, 57 f., 78 f.

while on the other hand the earliest judgment of Judah is hopeful ;

(3) That in this way Isaiah's prophetic task would at first have been one with that of his two predecessors Amos (also a man of Judah) and Hosea, both of whom prophesied primarily and almost exclusively against Ephraim.

It might be added that in this way chap. vi. forms an excellent introduction to chap. vii., where the doom of Ephraim is a guiding principle. Further, since in this case we can readily believe the prediction was one of absolute extermination, we are free to accept the evidence of the LXX.¹ that the last clause of ver. 13 ("so the holy seed is the stock thereof") is not original. With its omission the verse and the figure it contains become clear: the felling of the tree corresponds to the first destruction (vers. 11, 12), the burning of the stump to the burning up (R.V. marg. ver. 13) of the tenth remaining over from the former destruction, "And if there be yet a tenth in it, it shall again be devoured, as is the case with a terebinth . . . whereof, at the felling, a stump (remaineth over)."

Thus in dealing with these earlier prophecies, and in order to justify his conclusion that Ephraim alone is at first regarded by Isaiah as irrevocably doomed, Hackmann requires to assume comparatively few glosses—the chief being vii. 15, 17, viii. 8, 9 and vi. 13*b*, in which last case he is supported by the LXX. Since in this way he both simplifies the exegesis of vi. 13 and vii. 10–17, and does away with perhaps greater assumptions otherwise necessary, he seems to me to have rendered this part of his theory probable; and he has, at the very least, done a service in drawing attention to the extent to which Isaiah at the outset of his career came into line with his predecessors in making the N. kingdom the object of his attack.

¹ An omission in the LXX. of Isaiah deserves attention, since the tendency of the translation is to amplify.

When, however, we come to examine the means by which he establishes his other position—that the doctrine of the Invincibility of Zion is not Isaianic—we find that far greater assumptions of interpolation and working over have to be made. It is impossible here to state or to criticise in any detail what can be said for these assumptions; it is moreover questionable whether their validity can be finally estimated, till all apparently intrusive matter in all other prophetic writings has been subjected to careful comparative examination. It must suffice here to state the passages rejected by Hackmann in the later prophecies; they are these—x. 20–27, xviii. 7, xxviii. 5, 6 (and possibly 23–29), xxix. 16–24 (at least for the most part), xxx. 18–33, xxxi. 5–9, xxxii. 1–8 (but probably not 9–20). Read with these omissions, the prophecies of the age of Sennacherib speak only of the certainty of Judah's destruction, not at all of the safety of Zion; then chap. x. presents us with a change of the prophet's attitude towards Assyria, but not, as has generally been supposed, of a change also in his opinion as to the fate of Jerusalem; then, too, the reference to the *destruction of Zion* (xxxii. 13, 14) is what we should expect, and the last utterance of the prophet that the people's sin shall not be forgiven till they die (xxii. 14) forms the natural close to the prophet's teaching. These omissions certainly simplify matters; of many of the difficulties due to the continuous interlacing of judgment and promise in chaps. xxviii.–xxxii., with which commentators have had to busy themselves, we should be rid if we could regard the passages of promise as non-Isaianic; but undoubtedly very strong reasons are necessary if we are to reject a whole series of passages many of which are closely interwoven with those still retained as genuine, and connected with one another by common ideas. Why, it may fairly be asked, just in Isaiah's prophecies should passages containing the doctrine of the Invincibility of Zion be embodied, and not, *e.g.*, in

Micah? In fairness to the theory it must however be mentioned that not all these passages can be regarded from Hackmann's standpoint as *interpolations*; if he is right, chaps. xxviii.—xxxii. originally existed as a separate collection of prophetic writings—in part by Isaiah, in part by others—made long after Isaiah's time; it would therefore be as unsuitable to term the non-Isaianic passages there found interpolations, as to say that, *e.g.*, chaps. xxiv.—xxvii. or xl.—lxvi. have been *interpolated* in the book of Isaiah. Full justice can in fact only be done, especially to this part of Hackmann's theory, by a study of his careful and suggestive discussion of the composition of the Book of Isaiah. The same must be said of his still more radical suggestion that the passages referring to the Messianic king (ix. 1–7, xi. 1–11) are non-Isaianic.

Perhaps the chief conclusion to be drawn from the preceding survey, will appear to be that it is impossible to trace the development of Isaiah's thought with any certainty. To some extent this is at present true; but we may yet hope by more systematic study of the composition of the prophetic books, by a careful comparative exegesis of apparently intrusive matter in each prophet's writings, and perhaps by further archæological discovery which will determine with greater certainty the dates of the respective prophecies, to be ultimately in a position to trace more accurately the growth of Isaiah's doctrine. Meantime discussions such as those that have been noticed are of value; for, as Hackmann justly observes, the tracing of individual religious ideas and critical analysis may and must at present go together. Methods which have proved successful in Pentateuchal studies should now be applied to the prophetic writings. It is as a careful attempt to do this that I have desired to gain for Dr. Hackmann's essay the attention of readers of THE EXPOSITOR.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.

*NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING ON THE SECOND
COMING OF CHRIST.*

V. MILLENARIANISM.

IN the earlier papers of this series, by a comparison of the various types of primitive eschatological teaching embodied in the New Testament, we have found complete historical proof that the early followers of Christ were looking forward to a definite moment when, unexpectedly, suddenly, audibly, and visibly Christ will return in bodily form from heaven to earth, to wake up the dead, to change the living servants of Christ, to judge all men, and to bring in the everlasting glory. In this confident and definite expectation, we found complete agreement between the Epistles of Paul, the Synoptist Gospels, the Fourth Gospel, and the Catholic Epistles. The same expectation finds expression also in the Book of Revelation. These various writers also teach that at the coming of Christ evil will be in power. And St. Paul teaches expressly that the appearance of Christ will be preceded by appearance of a new and terrible form of evil, an outward and conspicuous manifestation of evil influences already more or less secretly operating among men; and that this evil power will be brought to nought by the brightness of the appearance of Christ. The Book of Revelation, however, differs from all the rest of the Bible by depicting, before the last apostacy, an earlier and overwhelming defeat of the hostile powers, lasting in its effects for a thousand years. In other words, the Book of Revelation teaches two interpositions of supernatural power, each overturning, one for a time, the other finally, the enemies of God and man. The relation of these two victories of good over evil to the second coming of Christ so frequently announced in the New Testament demands now further enquiry.

The question before us is whether the vision of Christ on

a white horse depicted in Revelation xix. 11, or that depicted in chapter xx. 11 on "a great white throne," corresponds to the audible and visible and bodily return of Christ so frequently announced in the other books of the New Testament and indeed in Revelation i. 7, xxii. 12, 20. This question must be answered by a comparison of the two visions and of the events following them with the harmonious teaching of the rest of the New Testament.

The very close similarity in thought and phrase between Revelation xx. 11-15 and Matthew xxv. 31-46 at once attracts attention. In each account, Christ sits upon a throne and all mankind stand before Him and are judged by Him according to their works. In exact agreement with these passages is John v. 28, 29, where at the bidding of Christ all the dead leave their graves and go forth to life or to judgment according as they have done things good or bad. Very similar also is 2 Thessalonians i. 6-10, where we read that Christ at His revelation from heaven will give relief to His servants but eternal destruction to those who obey not the Gospel. This similarity is a strong presumption that these four passages refer to the same solemn event.

On the other hand, the vision of Christ in Revelation xix. 11-16 and the events portrayed in verses 17-21 present not nearly so many points of coincidence with the teaching of the New Testament about the second coming of Christ. For nowhere else is Christ's coming represented as that of a soldier armed for fight, nor is the destruction which follows His coming represented as a military overthrow. He comes, not as a soldier for the fight, but as a judge armed with irresistible power.

This preliminary judgment is confirmed by insuperable difficulties involved in the supposition that the coming of Christ for which the early Christians were waiting will be followed by the Millennium and Apostacy described in

Revelation xx. 1-9. This will appear if we pursue this supposition to its consequences, taking into our account the indisputable teaching of other parts of the New Testament.

We must conceive the world going on in its usual course, and evil in great power. In a moment, as in the earlier papers we have learnt, a voice from heaven is heard, and Christ appears. At that voice, and to meet their appearing Lord, the murdered servants of Christ wake up from the sleep of death. But not these only. For we cannot conceive this marked honour given only to those who have actually shed their blood for Christ when so many others, *e.g.* Wycliffe and Luther, were equally faithful and equally ready to die for Him. If there be, before the Millennium, a bodily resurrection, it must be shared by all the faithful and departed servants of Christ. And along with these risen ones, we must conceive, according to the plain teaching of 1 Corinthians xv. 52, 1 Thessalonians iv. 16, that the righteous then living will be changed and caught up to meet Christ. What about the living children of living believers? Infants, we may suppose, will be caught up with their parents. But what about those in their teens? Surely there will be a selection, the good ones taken and the bad ones left behind along with those who, not being servants of Christ, will have no part in the resurrection which will immediately follow the voice and appearance of Christ.

What becomes of the adult unsaved ones? Are we to suppose that they will continue on earth, eating and drinking, marrying and being given in marriage, in successive generations? And what will be the moral state of mankind when the salt of the earth and the light of the world are removed? It might be thought that it will become a pandemonium. We must however remember that at the beginning of the Millennium the prince of darkness has been bound. But unfortunately there are no servants of Christ

left on earth to take advantage of this removal of the great enemy of God and man and to preach to the wicked a Gospel of repentance. And of any general turning to God we have no hint in Revelation xx. 1-6, the only passage in the whole Bible which speaks about the Millennium.

Let us now try to follow, on the supposition before us, the risen servants of Christ. Their bodily resurrection, and such is expressly mentioned in 1 Corinthians xv. 23, 35, 44 as following at once the coming of Christ, implies a definite place. Where are they? Not on earth. For this is still occupied by the unsaved, who were not caught up to meet Christ. And we cannot conceive mingled together on the same planet some who have yet to die and others who have passed through death and will die no more. Such confusion of the present age with the age to come is in the last degree unlikely. If not on earth, are we to suppose them to be somewhere between earth and heaven, visible to the wicked still living and dying on earth? This suggestion would so completely change the conditions of human life and probation on earth as to make its continuance utterly incomprehensible. Or are we to suppose that the risen ones and the changed survivors will suddenly vanish from earth into the unseen world, in some such way as the ascending body of Christ vanished from His disciples' view? In this case, the second coming of Christ would be a voice and appearance of Christ from heaven, heard and seen¹ by all men, yet followed by His disappearance and the disappearance of all the good people then living on earth. Of such disappearance of Christ after His return, we have no hint in the New Testament; and it contradicts the whole tenor of its teaching on this subject.

Touching the condition of the world during the Millennium, the supposition we are considering leaves us in utter perplexity. The naughty children of pious and living parents

¹ Revelation i. 7.

have been left to the mercy of a race from which all the righteous have been taken away. Satan is bound. But, unless the risen ones are sent to proclaim the Gospel to the unsaved, there are none to teach them. The only good information we have about the world is that at the close of the Millennium it contains (Revelation xx. 9) "a camp of the saints."

After a long period, described as "a thousand years," during which Satan is bound, he is liberated, and returns to the earth. He is welcomed by a host as numerous "as the sand of the sea," who follow him to make war against the people of God. This quick and great apostacy proves that the Millennium is no triumphant and universal reign of righteousness. And it disproves the supposition that during the thousand years Christ is reigning visibly on earth. For we cannot conceive such revolt in His visible presence, nor can we conceive that at the release of Satan Christ will retreat, even for a short time, from the realm over which He has reigned so long. In any case, the triumph of Satan is short. Fire falls suddenly from heaven, a great throne appears, the books are opened, and all men, good and bad, are judged according to their works.

The above difficulties and contradictions are serious objections to the hypothesis which involves them.

The theory of a pre-millennial advent of Christ lies open to other insuperable objections. Our Lord asserts clearly in Matthew xxiv. 29, Mark xiii. 24, 25, that at His return the sun and moon will cease to shine and the stars fall from heaven. This implies a dissolution of nature. A still more graphic picture of this dissolution is given in Revelation vi. 12-17, as heralding the great day of the anger of God. Scarcely less graphic is the picture given in Revelation xx. 11, "from whose face fled the earth and the heaven, and place was not found for them." Now the dissolution of nature described in this last passage evidently follows the

Millennium. For it is impossible to separate the vision in Revelation xx. 11 from the apostacy immediately preceding it; and this is said expressly in verse 7 to follow the Millennium. In other words, the Book of Revelation announces a dissolution of nature following the Millennium. Our Lord announced, as we have seen, a similar dissolution to accompany His second coming. If, then, this coming precedes the Millennium, there will be two dissolutions of nature, separated by more than a thousand years; and, between these two catastrophes, a tremendous assault by a great multitude of followers of Satan against the servants of God.

Still further difficulties surround the theory before us. In Matthew xxv. 31-46 we read, "When the Son of Man shall come in His glory, and all the angels with Him, then He will sit upon the throne of His glory, and there will be gathered together before Him all the nations, and He will separate them one from another as the shepherd separates the sheep from the goats." Our Lord concludes by announcing that those on His left hand "will go away to eternal punishment, but the righteous to eternal life." Indisputably, the words, "when the Son of Man comes," refer to that one definite coming of which Christ spoke so much. This is placed beyond doubt by the complete harmony of all that Christ says about this great event, which was ever in His thoughts. If, then, Christ's return is to be followed by the Millennium described in Revelation xx. 1-6, we must suppose that after this solemn separation the goats will again break in upon the sheep with the terrible assault depicted in Revelation xx. 9 as following the Millennium. This is inconceivable.

Other difficulties remain. Our Lord announces in John v. 28, 29 that "an hour cometh in which all that are in the grave will hear His voice and will go forth, they that have done the good things to a resurrection of life, and they that

have done the evil things to a resurrection of judgment." This announcement is in close accord with Revelation xx. 13-15, where we read, "The sea gave up the dead in it, and death and Hades gave up the dead in them; and they were judged, each according to their works. . . . And if any one was not found written in the Book of Life, he was cast into the lake of fire." Each of these passages suggests irresistibly one universal resurrection and judgment. The theory we are discussing requires us to believe that within the hour of which Christ speaks there will be two bodily resurrections (in addition to the spiritual resurrection referred to in John v. 25, Ephesians ii. 6), separated by more than a thousand years, one of the righteous only, the other of righteous and wicked.

That an earlier resurrection of the righteous is not asserted or suggested in 1 Thessalonians iv. 16, 1 Corinthians xv. 23, I have already proved on pages 100, 105, of my second paper.

One more objection here demands notice. In John vi. 39, 40, 44, Christ announces that He will raise His people "on the last day." The same hope is expressed by Martha in John xi. 24. It is altogether incongruous to include in "the last day" events so dissimilar as the resurrection of the righteous, the thousand years' bondage of Satan, his release, the assault of Gog and Magog and its overthrow, and the final judgment. Similarly, in 1 Corinthians xv. 52, St. Paul speaks of the voice which will awake the dead servants of Christ, and change the living, including himself and his readers, as "the last trumpet." Now, if the righteous are to be raised before the Millennium and the wicked after it, there will be two resurrections; and, since the wicked are to be summoned to judgment by the voice of Christ, this voice must be the last trumpet, and the earlier voice, which will summon those to whom St. Paul refers in 1 Corinthians xv. 52, cannot be so described.

It will be not the last trumpet, but perhaps the last but one.

Such are the many insuperable difficulties surrounding the hypothesis of a pre-millennial advent of Christ. It breaks up the one definite coming for which His disciples were waiting into two comings separated by more than a thousand years, each heralded by a trumpet voice and followed by a resurrection of the dead and a dissolution of nature. The period between these two comings and trumpets and resurrections is left in inextricable confusion, and concludes with a tremendous assault of the evil against the good.

We now ask, What evidence can be brought in favour of the hypothesis before us, to set against the above insuperable objections? No direct evidence. For throughout the New Testament we find no hint of two bodily comings of Christ and of two bodily resurrections, which are essential elements of the theory we are considering. The only evidence which can be adduced for a pre-millennial advent of Christ is the vision of Christ on a white horse in Revelation xix. 11, and the first resurrection in chapter xx. 6. For certainly nowhere else in the Bible do we read of a reign of Christ to be followed by apostacy. Moreover, the force of this scanty evidence rests on the assumption that these visions cannot find their realisation apart from the definite bodily return of Christ for which His earlier followers were waiting. In other words, we are asked to modify and transform the abundant, and various, and harmonious teaching of the New Testament about the second coming of Christ in deference to an exposition of seventeen verses of the most mysterious and difficult book in the Bible. Even if this exposition were indisputable, we might fairly ask whether it is safe to throw into confusion, for such a reason, the plain teaching of the rest of the New Testament. But the exposition which is made to bear the burden of issues so

great is far from certain, or rather, is in itself improbable; and, as we have seen, another exposition involving no such confusion is at once suggested by the plain meaning of the words used in the passage in question.

It is no part of my present task to explain as a whole the imagery of the very difficult Book of Revelation. But, indisputably, many of its pictures must have a purely spiritual meaning, *i.e.*, they must depict conditions and events which exist and take place only in the spiritual world, apart from any visible disturbance of the course of external nature. As examples, I must quote the first five seals in Revelation vi. 1-11. On the other hand, the sixth seal, in verses 12-17, evidently breaks through the veil and describes, in such symbolic form as men on earth can understand, events which will visibly set aside the ordinary course of nature. This intermingling of the unseen and the seen, often without indication of the transition, warns us to use special caution in exposition of the pictures of this mysterious book. The only safe rule is to interpret the pictures in the light of the plain teaching of the rest of the New Testament. The theory before us reverses this method, and sets aside the plain meaning of plain proof in deference to an interpretation of one series of difficult metaphors.

The pictures of Christ coming on a white horse, of the angel in the sun calling the birds to feast on the victims about to be slain, of the beast and the kings of the earth and their armies marching to battle, of the angel with a chain binding Satan, have very little in common with the metaphors used to describe the coming of Christ to judgment. And they certainly cannot be interpreted literally. They are therefore a very unsafe foundation on which to build an important doctrine. Moreover, we have no hint that "the souls" of the martyrs who lived and reigned with Christ had experienced a bodily resurrection. In

Revelation vi. 9-11, we have another vision of martyred "souls" who are bidden to wait until their brethren, like themselves, have been slain. These impatient souls cannot have entered into the consummation involved in the resurrection of the body. Moreover, that in John v. 25-29 we read of two resurrections in close juxtaposition, one spiritual and the other bodily, and that St. Paul taught frequently that believers are already risen with Christ, warns us not hastily to assume that "the First Resurrection" must necessarily be a resurrection of the body. In short, the exposition upon which is built the doctrine of the pre-millennial advent of Christ has no foundation in sound exegesis of the New Testament. It may therefore be dismissed as having no place in the Gospel of Christ.

The doctrine I have endeavoured to overturn owes its acceptance by not a few sincere and earnest Christians to a natural rebound from another doctrine still further removed from the teaching of the New Testament, yet prevalent in some circles of religious activity. The doctrine of the second coming of Christ, which moulded the entire thought of His early followers, has been practically ignored by many modern Christians. An indefinite idea has silently grown up among them that the departed servants of Christ go at death to their full and final reward, and that the Gospel will make progress among men until, by its instrumentality, the whole world and all human hearts are brought to bow in unreserved homage to Christ. These doctrines leave no place for His bodily return to earth. For His dead servants have already attained their full consummation, and the whole purpose of God touching His kingdom among men will be accomplished in the ordinary course of the Gospel of Christ. They who hold this view say little or nothing about the second coming of Christ. It lies outside their spiritual horizon. That which to the early Christians was so much, is nothing to them. Against

this oversight of so large an element of the teaching of the New Testament, the doctrine which in this paper I have combated is an extreme revolt. And many sympathise with the revolt because they know enough of the New Testament to condemn the loose theology just mentioned. Unfortunately, by taking up a theory which breaks down by the weight of its own absurdity, they do something indirectly to strengthen the belief which they reject. The only safe remedy is to reinstate, by careful exegesis, the actual teaching of the New Testament.

Closely connected with the doctrine of the pre-millennial Advent is the question of the time of Christ's return. Most of its advocates expect an early return, almost at any hour. Such early return, they who reject this doctrine cannot expect. For, whatever they may think about the Millennium, to them St. Paul's warning to the Thessalonican Christians that the Day of the Lord was not close at hand, is still valid. He taught plainly, in 2 Thessalonians ii. 3-12, that Christ will not come until first have come a new and terrible form of evil. In his day, all this was quite consistent with an expectation that Christ might return during the lifetime of men then living. For so rapid had been the recent development of the kingdom of God that a single lifetime seemed sufficient for the appearance of the Man of Sin, and for his destruction by the visible return of Christ. Such rapid development we cannot expect now. During eighteen centuries no new form of evil has appeared, nothing which can for a moment be identified with the great enemy about whom St. Paul wrote. And the analogy of these centuries makes an early and sudden appearance most unlikely. Moreover the present age, and those preceding it, have been times of spiritual progress; and the spiritual forces at work for good in the world bear no marks of exhaustion. We cannot conceive that this progress, wrought by God through ordinary instruments,

will be interrupted by the hand of God. The time of Christ's return must be one of spiritual stagnation and retrogression. Consequently, assured as we are that a moment will come when unexpectedly Christ will lay His hand upon the wheels of time and stop them for ever, and sweep away the platform on which they have revolved so long, and build upon its ruins a New Earth and Heaven, we cannot expect this longed-for consummation in our own lifetime. Weary as we are with happy toil, we shall lay us down for our last sleep in His arms till the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised incorruptible.

In his able volume on *The Revelation of St. John*, Dr. Milligan, after calling attention to the difficulties which make impossible the theory of a pre-millennial Advent, suggests that "the thousand years," and the "little time" which follows them, do not denote duration in time, but only the idea of completeness. He interprets these periods as simultaneous, and as each co-extensive with the whole Christian dispensation, during which he supposes that in reference to the saints Satan will be completely bound, but in reference to others in some measure free. So on page 210: "Satan is bound for a thousand years—*i.e.* he is completely bound. The saints reign for a thousand years—*i.e.* they are introduced into a state of perfect and glorious victory." Also on page 213: "When it is said Satan shall be loosed 'for a little time,' the meaning is that he shall be loosed for *the whole Christian age.*" The only examples he gives of this remarkable and unlikely method of exposition are Ezekiel xxxix. 9, where we read that, after the destruction of Magog, the inhabitants of the cities of Israel will for seven years burn the weapons of the conquered and will need no other fuel; and verse 12, where we are told that the house of Israel will be for seven years burying the slain

of Gog and purifying the land from the presence of their corpses.

These examples are no proof whatever that in symbolic language longer or shorter periods of time may denote merely greater or less completeness. For in this case the greatness of the overthrow is proved by the length of time during which the captured weapons lasted for fuel and the length of time required to bury the dead. But the periods of time mentioned in Revelation xx. 3-7 afford no such indications of completeness. Unless consecutive periods of time and events are referred to in the words of verse 7, "when the thousand years shall be accomplished, Satan shall be loosed from his prison," no intelligible meaning can be given to symbolic language. Moreover, to say that Satan is bound, "in order that he may not deceive the nations any more until the thousand years are completed," as we read in verse 3, and then to say, as we read in verse 8, that at the same time he will "go forth to deceive the nations in the four corners of the earth," is flat contradiction. Dr. Milligan's interpretation is as baseless in exegesis, and as absurd, as that which it is designed to supersede.

In a volume entitled *Parousia*, Mr. J. Stuart Russell has endeavoured to prove, if I understand him correctly, that the coming of Christ announced in the New Testament took place at the destruction of Jerusalem. He argues that Christ promised to return during the lifetime of the men of His own day; and from this, as a sure starting point, he infers with perfect confidence that He did then return, viz. at the fall of the Jewish state. All else in the New Testament is brought, by great exegetical violence, into harmony with this foregone conclusion. The impossibility of this exegesis has been made evident by the exposition in this series of papers of the chief passages bearing upon the subject. Such distortion of the plain meaning of plain words

of Holy Scripture cannot help forward theological research.

The results of this paper are chiefly negative. Its aim has been to disprove certain interpretations which have seriously distorted the teaching of the New Testament about the second coming of Christ and have done much to bring the whole subject into contempt or disregard.

In a concluding paper I shall discuss the spiritual and practical significance of the second coming of Christ and its bearing upon the thought and life of the present day.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

OPTIMISM THE ATTITUDE OF FAITH.

PROFESSOR ORR opens his admirable Kerr Lectures with an exposition of the German idea, "Weltansicht," and pleads with much force for a Christian theory of the world. It is an interesting coincidence that the two eminent men who delivered the last Gifford Lectures have both addressed themselves to the same subject in their treatment of religion. The Master of Balliol, in his *Evolution of Religion*, and Professor Pfeleiderer, in his *Philosophy of Religion*, have felt it necessary to embrace "Optimism and Pessimism." It is a sign of the times: it is also a reflection on the past. Philosophy for more than a century has realized the situation and has faced the problem of the Race with energy and tenacity. "What is the meaning of Life?" and "What is its drift?" this kind of question lay heavy on the mind of thinkers, and they did their best to answer it. Unfortunately the apparatus at their command was defective, for the philosophers were not able to avail themselves of the two chief factors in the situation—the revelation of the Will of God in sacred history and the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. They worked with the postulates of reason and the visible facts of history. Sometimes they came to a conclusion of hope, sometimes of despair: but they wrestled to the end with unshaken courage. Whether philosophy has failed or succeeded, it deserves the credit of an honourable attempt. Philosophy was not blind to the world-outlook, nor indifferent to the world-sorrow.

While the problem has taken shape within a century, it has existed since the beginning of ordered thought, and the pendulum has swung with regular beat between two extremes. The Homeric age with its frank joy in nature—the brightness of the sky and the glory of a man's strength—which is the fresh youth of the world—was followed by

the age of Æschylus with its sense of the tragedy of life—its shameful falls, its irresistible hindrances, its inevitable woes—which is the haggard manhood of the world. The splendid idealism of the greater Hebrew prophets who saw the dawn breaking afar on the Person of the Messiah gave way to the bitter cynicism of the author of Ecclesiastes. Judaism, if you accept the Prophets as its most characteristic interpreters, raised optimism to a creed and embodied it as a people. Buddhism, if you judge it by the example of its illustrious founder, disparaged even existence, and has clouded the horizon of the East. At the beginning of last century Leibnitz declared this the best of all possible worlds, and towards its close Rousseau preached a state of nature as Paradise, but after this century had been born in blood and fire, Schopenhauer considered that life was less than gain, and Leopardi hungered for death. In our own day we have heard Emerson lift up his voice in perpetual sunshine, and have gone with Carlyle when he walked in darkness and saw no light; and if Pippa sings,—

“ God’s in His heaven,
All’s right with the world,”

Thompson has written the “City of Dreadful Night.” It is a long action and reaction—an antithesis that, outside Religion, has no synthesis, and one is driven to the conclusion that optimism and pessimism are only half truths. They are the offspring of moods of thought, and carried to an extreme include their own Nemesis. The shallow optimism of Leibnitz was the preparation for Schopenhauer, and the morbid pessimism of Hartmann is a prophecy of optimism.

The controversies of philosophy have often been metaphysical—in the regions beyond life, but no one can deny that this long strife has been practical—in the midst of life’s hurly-burly. No human being can escape it unless he be

dead to the passion of Humanity, or unless he have never realized the distinction between what is and what ought to be—the Real and the Ideal. The unspeakable agony of human life, which has been a long Gethsemane, and the unintelligible condition of the lower animals, which is a very carnival of slaughter, beat on the doors of reason and heart. It is not wonderful that some have tried to shelter themselves in a fool's Paradise from the groans they could not still, or that others feeling the hideous facts judged it better to die than to live,—that some have imagined no other God than a blind and cruel necessity, or that others have conceived two contending forces of good and evil. Nothing is wonderful in speculation or action save indifference to the enigma of life.

One recognises the limitations of Philosophy, and turns with expectation to Theology, which is fully equipped for the solution of this problem. Theology is the science of religion, whose work it is to collect and analyze the facts of the spiritual consciousness, and it is rich in treasures. It has, for instance, a doctrine of God, with profound conceptions of His righteousness and love, His wisdom and power. Correlate the character of God and the destiny of the Race. Should not this illuminate the darkness? Theology has a doctrine of the Incarnation, which implies the union of humanity with Himself in the Eternal Son of God. Is this high alliance to have no influence on the future of the Race? Theology has also a doctrine of the Holy Ghost, which asserts the Presence of God in this world and His continual operation. Will not the immanence of God carry great issues? From her standpoint Theology commands the situation in its length and breadth, and can speak with a solitary authority on the mystery of life and the goal of the Race. It suddenly occurs to one as amazing that Philosophy should undertake a subject for which Theology alone can be adequate.

It is much more amazing to discover that on this burning question Theology up till quite a recent date has been silent, and still delays her deliverance. Christian Theology has nothing to say to the Race; her concern has been wholly with the individual. The Race has been the subject of a huge catastrophe, and is left out of account. It is on the individual Theology expends all her labour, and her most elaborate doctrines are the explanation how he is to be saved from the general wreckage. Her outlook for him is an unqualified optimism so far as he is separated from his Race. He will be sustained and trained in this life as in a penitentiary, and then will begin to live in heaven—his real home. No single doctrine of Theology, with the doubtful exception of original sin, has, till recently, been applied to the Race. The realization of the Fatherhood, and the expansion of the Incarnation, are of yesterday. Theology will now explore the consequences of the Incarnation, and tell us soon what it means that the Son of God is also the Son of Man. Hitherto pessimism or optimism lay outside Theology because the Race had been abandoned.

When one consults the supreme Book of Religion, the result is at first a perplexity and then an encouragement. Any one might take a brief for the pessimism of the Bible, and prove his case to the hilt. The irresistible assaults of evil, the loathsome taint of sin, the inevitable entail of punishment, the wrong of the innocent, the martyrdom of the righteous, the slavery of labour, the futility of life, the moan of sorrow, are all in this Book, through which the current of human life rushes to the eternal sea. But if one should choose to take a brief for the optimism of the Bible, he could as easily win his case. The beauty of penitence, the passion for God, the struggle after righteousness, the joy of forgiveness, the attainments in character, the examples of patience, the victory over this world, invest

human life in the Bible with undying beauty. It is natural that both pessimists and optimists should claim the sanction of the Hebrew Scriptures: that any intelligent reader might lay down the book with the vision of the Race carrying its bitter cross along the Via Dolorosa or crowned with glory in the heavenly places. It seems a contradiction: it points to a solution. No one would dare to say that there is no ground for the alternation of moods of hope and despair that have lifted and cast down the seers of our Race. Within one connected and consistent literature both moods find their strongest and sanest utterance—a pessimism that, even in Ecclesiastes, still clings to God and morals, an optimism that is never shallow or material. Within the same book we look for the reconciliation of this long antinomy and the revelation of a deeper unity. We are not disappointed; it is found in Jesus.

No one has seriously denied that Jesus was an optimist, although it has been hinted that He was a dreamer, and no one can object to the optimism of Jesus, for it was in spite of circumstances. He was born of a peasant woman: in early age He worked for His bread: as a Prophet He depended on alms; during the great three years He knew not where to lay His head. But the bareness and hardship of His life never embittered His soul, neither do they stiffen Him into Stoicism. A sweet contentment possesses Him, and He lives as a child in His Father's house. This poorest of men warns His disciples against carking care and vain anxiety; He persuades them to a simple faith in the Divine Providence. They are to "take no thought for the morrow, for the morrow will take thought for the things of itself." "Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof." They are to "behold the fowls of the air," and to "take no thought for meat or drink," to "consider the lilies of the field," and to "take no thought for raiment." Jesus met the grinding poverty of a Galilean peasant's life with

one inexhaustible consolation,—“Your Heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things” (St. Matt. vi.).

The severity of Jesus' circumstances was added to their poverty, since this Man, who lived only for others, was the victim of the most varied injury. He was exiled as soon as He was born; His townsmen would have killed Him; His brethren counted Him mad; the city of His mighty works did not believe; the multitudes He had helped forsook Him; the professional representatives of religion set themselves against Jesus, and pursued this holiest of men with ingenious slanders; He was a “Samaritan” (or heretic), and “had a devil”; He was a “gluttonous man and a winebibber,” and kept disreputable company; He was a blasphemer and deceiver (St. John viii. 48). A huge conspiracy encompassed Him, and laboured for His death; one of His intimates betrayed Him; the priests of God produced false witnesses against Him; the people He loved clamoured for His death; the Roman power He had respected denied Him justice; He was sent to the vilest death. During this long ordeal His serenity was never disturbed; He was never angry save with sin. He never lost control of Himself or became the slave of circumstances. His bequest to the disciples was Peace, and He spake of Joy in the Upper Room. He was so lifted above the turmoil of this life, that Pilate was amazed, and, amid the agony of the Cross, He prayed for His enemies. Nothing has so embittered men as utter poverty or social injustice. Jesus endured both, and maintained the radiant brightness of His soul. His was optimism set in the very environment of pessimism.

Jesus saw the Race into which He had been born in the light that illuminated His own life, and held out to them the Hope which sustained His own soul. Pagan poets had placed the age of gold in the far past; Hebrew prophets

referred it to the distant future. Jesus dared to say it might be now and here. It was the glory of Isaiah to imagine a Kingdom of Righteousness that would yet be established with outward sanctions of authority on earth. It was the achievement of Jesus to set up the Kingdom of Righteousness within the heart with the eternal sanctions of Love. He was the first to insist that the one bondage a man need fear was sin ; that no man need be the slave of sin unless He willed ; that freedom from sin was perfect liberty, and that any man could enter into heaven by retiring within a clean and loving soul. The highest reaches of optimism have conceived a state of physical comfort and placed it far away. Jesus preached a Kingdom of Holiness, and placed it in the soul. He had the faith to deliver this Gospel where the Jewish world was a hollow unreality, and the Pagan world one corruption. It was the very extravagance of optimism.

The attitude of Jesus was amazing in the wideness of His vision, in the assurance of His hope. His kingdom might be as a grain of mustard seed : in its branches the souls of men would yet take refuge. It might be only a morsel of leaven hidden in the mass of society : the world would be regenerated by its influence (St. Matt. xiii. 33). He prepared twelve men with immense care that they might carry His kingdom to the ends of the world. Although He never passed beyond the borders of Syria in His mission, He grasped the nations in His faith, and saw them " come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south," and " sit down in the Kingdom of God " (St. Luke xiii. 29). Before His betrayal Jesus administered a sacrament that was to last till His second coming (St. Luke xxii. 17-20). After He rose from the dead He commanded His disciples to evangelize the world (St. Matt. xxviii. 19). He did not hesitate to say that all men would be drawn to Him, Who was a synonym for Righteousness,

Joy and Peace. Jesus hoped the best, not for the individual only, but also for the Race.

The grounds for Jesus' sublime optimism were three, and the first was the will of God. With the extreme left of pessimism Jesus believed that there was a Will at the heart of the universe working slowly, constantly, and irresistibly. But it is not blind, immoral, impersonal—mere Titanic force. It is the expression and energy of Love. This Will might appear under strange phenomena, might impose great sufferings, might have immense restraint, but it works for goodness. It might send Jesus to the Cross, but now and ever it was a sure and gracious Will. The future lay in that Will and must be bright. It was an ancient Father that said, "God works all things up into what is better"; and a modern heretic who declared, "God, who spent ages in fitting the earth for the residence of man, may well spend ages more in fitting rectified man to inhabit a renovated earth." This was the faith and patience of Jesus.

Jesus also believed in man, and therein he differed from the pessimists of His own day. The Pharisees regarded the mass of the people as moral refuse, the unavoidable waste from the finished product of Pharisaism. With Jesus the common people were the raw material for the Kingdom of God, rich in the possibilities of sainthood. When Jesus made His own *Apologia* in the 15th chapter of St. Luke's Gospel, He also offered their apology for the people. They were not callous and hopeless sinners, only sheep that have wandered from the fold, and know not the way back; not useless and worthless human stuff, but souls that carried beneath the rust and grime the stamp of their birth, and might be put out at usury; not outcasts whose death would be a good riddance, but children loved and missed in their Father's House. This wreck, Jesus perpetually insisted, is not the man—only his lower self, ignorant, perverted,

corrupt; the other self lies hidden and must be released. That is the real self, and when it is released you come to the man. "When he came to himself," said Jesus of the prodigal (St. Luke xv. 17). This was Jesus' reading of publicans and sinners,—the pariahs of that civilization. He moved among the people with a sanguine expectation; ever demanding achievements of the most unlikely, never knowing when he might not be gladdened by a response. An unwavering and unbounded faith in humanity sustained His heart and transformed its subjects. Zacchæus, the hated tax-gatherer, makes a vast surrender, and shows also that he is a son of Abraham. St. Mary Magdalene, the byword of society, has in her the passion of a saint. St. Matthew abandons a custom-house to write a Gospel. St. John leaves his nets to become the mystic of the ages. St. Peter flings off his weakness, and changes into the rock of the Church. With everything against Him, Jesus treated men as sons of God, and His optimism has had its vindication.

Jesus' attitude of hope rested also on His ideal of Life. His own disciples could not enter into His mind or see with His eyes. Modern reformers have sadly missed His standpoint. Laden with reproach and injury, He seemed to His friends the victim of intolerable ill-usage. As the Cross loomed in sight they besought Him to save Himself. They pitied Him who did not pity Himself; they were furious for Him who was Himself satisfied. For life with Jesus was not meat and drink, nor ease and honour. It was the perfection of the soul, and the way unto this high goal was the Cross. If suffering was the will of God, then it is a good in disguise; if it be the discipline of holiness, it is to be welcomed. The Son of man must be crucified before He can rise in power. He must fall as a corn of wheat into the ground before He can bring forth much fruit. This was the order of things for Him and for all men, and out of the

baptism of fire men will come clean souls. Jesus did not ignore the black shadow of sin; He did not fall into the sickly optimism of last century. Jesus did not regard man as the sport of a cruel Fate; He did not yield to the gloomy pessimism which is settling down on this dying century. He illuminated the darkness of human misery with the light of a Divine purpose, and made the evidence for despair an argument for hope.

It must be admitted that Jesus had moods, and in one of them He sometimes lost heart. One cannot forget the gloom of certain parables:—the doom of the fruitless tree; the execution of the wicked husbandmen; the casting out of the unprofitable servant; the judgment on the uncharitable. He once doubted whether there would be faith at His coming; He prophesied woe to Capernaum; He wept over Jerusalem; He poured out His wrath on the Pharisees. But it was not about the world—the Samaritan woman, the mother from Tyre, the Roman centurion—His faith failed. It was about the Church—the Priests, the Scribes, the Pharisees, the Rulers. It remains for ever a solemn warning that while the Church is continually tempted to lose hope of the world, the one section of humanity of which Jesus despaired was the Church.

When one turns for facts to verify Jesus' optimism, the handiest, although not the most conclusive, is the growth of the Christian Church. The Church is to the kingdom what the electric current is to electricity. It is the kingdom organised for worship and aggression; it is the kingdom coming to a point and reduced to machinery. You could have the kingdom without the Church, and that day may come; you could have no Church without the kingdom. The Church is a rough index of the spread and vitality of the kingdom, and no one can deny that the history of the Church has been the outstanding phenomenon of modern times. It began with a handful of Jewish peasants, cast

out by their own nation, and it embarked on a march of unparalleled conquest. From Jerusalem to Antioch, from Antioch to Asia, from Asia to Rome, this new unworldly faith made its victorious way, and from Rome to the ends of the earth. There is almost no land now where the Church has not sent her missionaries, has not planted her standard, has not enrolled her converts; and if there be such, it is watched with greedy eyes. Her weakness, her failings, her blunders, her sins, have been patent to all, but they have only served to prove how prolific were the sources that recruited her shattered ranks, how constant the force that made itself felt through so imperfect an instrument. There are great religions on the earth besides the Church, but they have seen their best days, and have begun to decay. The faith of Jesus is moving to its zenith. There are strong empires to-day dividing the world between them, but none will venture to say that one of them is so likely to live as the Church Catholic. Her increase may be by thousands or millions, but it is evident she has no serious rival to dispute her final triumph, no hopeless hindrance save her own coldness.

But no one can have understood Jesus, who concludes that the Church embraces the kingdom of God. Are there not many persons who have no formal connection with the Church, and yet are keeping the commandments of Jesus and have the likeness of His character? They have not been baptized into His Name, but they follow in His steps; they do not show forth His Name, but they die daily in His service. They have been born into a Christian atmosphere; they have inherited the Christian nature; they have responded to the Christian spirit. What is one to say about these Samaritans? They do not answer to their names at the temple with the Priests and Levites, and therein they may have suffered loss; but they show well on the roadside where the sick man is lying. What did Jesus mean by His

marked approbation of the Samaritans? It was not that He thought them right in their separation from the Jewish Church, and He spoke plainly on that matter to the Samaritan woman. It was to show that life is deeper than forms, and that incorrect doctrine may be consistent with the noblest character.

The kingdom Jesus imagined is wider even than the sphere of Christendom, and extends where men have owed nothing to the subtle strain of Christian heredity. In that great Mogul Emperor Akbar, who in the sixteenth century had discovered the principle of religious toleration: those Moslem saints whose fine charity is embodied in the legend of Abou-ben-Adhem: the renunciation of Buddha, the light of Asia: that Roman Emperor, whom the young men called "Marcus my father," the old men "Marcus my son," the man of middle age "Marcus my brother"—in such lives one recognises the distinctive qualities of the kingdom. It is surely a narrow mind, and worse—a narrow heart—that would belittle the noble sayings that fell from the lips of outside saints or discredit the virtues of their character. Is it not more respectful to God, the Father of mankind, and more in keeping with the teaching of the Son of Man, to believe that everywhere and in all ages can be found not only the prophecies and broken gleams, but also the very children of the kingdom? In Clements' noble words, "Some with the consciousness of what Jesus is to them, others not as yet; some as friends, others as faithful servants, others barely as servants."

The Sermon on the Mount is the measure of Jesus' optimism, and its gradual fulfilment His justification. His ideas have matured in the human consciousness, and are now bursting into flower before our eyes. Thoughtful men of many schools are giving their mind to the programme of Jesus, and asking whether it ought not to be attempted. The ideal of Life, one dares now to hope, is to

be realized within measurable distance, and the dreams of the Galilean Prophet become history.

When the kingdom comes in its greatness, it will fulfil every religion and destroy none, clearing away the imperfect and opening up reaches of goodness not yet imagined, till it has gathered into its bosom whatsoever things are true and honest and just and pure and lovely. It standeth on the earth as the city of God with its gates open by night and by day, into which entereth nothing that defileth, but into which is brought the glory and power of the nations. It is the natural home of the good ; as Zwingli, the Swiss reformer, said in his dying confession, " Not one good man, one holy spirit, one faithful soul, whom you will not then behold with God."

JOHN WATSON.

*PROFESSOR LINDSAY'S ARTICLE ON PROFESSOR
W. ROBERTSON SMITH'S DOCTRINE OF
SCRIPTURE.*

AN old friend of Robertson Smith, to whom his name and fame are dear, but to whom fairness in discussion and just appreciation of past and present theologians are still dearer, ventures to criticise one portion of the above-mentioned article. It is surely not quite fair to contrast the theory of the Bible put forward by Robertson Smith as a young and highly trained professor in 1879-1880, and intended mainly for the benefit of students of the Scottish Presbyterian Church, with that put forward or suggested by older and less perfectly trained theologians belonging to a Church of more composite origin, who had to consider, not simply what they as individuals thought reasonable, but what would be intelligible to ordinary members of their church. The latter theory was no doubt too slight, and therefore inadequate, but it does not represent the highest teachings of those who have succeeded Williams, Wilson, and Stanley. That the sympathies of those who may with more or less correctness be described as Broad Church professors of theology are with those leaders of Biblical research in the German Evangelical Church who were also close friends of Robertson Smith, is notorious, and this surely makes it highly improbable that they "feel" any "insuperable difficulties" in the intellectual position which they occupy (*see* EXPOSITOR, p. 261), though they may naturally feel great difficulties in converting the mass of English students to a truer way of thinking on the Bible. They, not less than Robertson Smith, are indebted at least as much to foreign as to native teachers, and, though they may not feel called upon to offer a reconstruction of doctrine, it is not

likely that they are conscious of being as thinkers or as teachers a long way behind the Robertson Smith of 1880. Possibly indeed some of them consider that while much that was put forward by that brilliantly gifted man in his *Defences* was sound, there are other points in which, from over-subtlety, a pardonable self-confidence, and a desire to keep in touch with old-fashioned theologians, he has ventured upon unsafe statements, and that a fuller and altogether non-sectional treatment of the doctrine of the Scriptures needs to be given.

It is of course not intended to deny that the second edition of Robertson Smith's *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, which so far as its main ideas are concerned does not differ from the first, represents, as accurately as its popular object admits, his revised opinions on the doctrine of the Bible as well as on criticism. These lines are only a friendly protest against the assumption that a "doctrine of Scripture" derived from Robertson Smith's more or less controversial *Defences* of 1879-80 is or can be his final legacy to students on the subject of the religious value of the Bible, and against the combination of this with an unsympathetic because not altogether comprehending criticism of certain Anglican theologians, for which, so far as it relates to a present "Broad Church school," Robertson Smith, incautious as he sometimes was, cannot be held responsible. The tendency of university Biblical teachers is on the whole not towards a revised Anglican, but, as has been hinted, towards a non-sectional treatment of the doctrine of the Scriptures.

Would not, then, the best plan for Professor Lindsay be to drop such an ambiguous designation as "the Broad Church school" altogether? Might not all who value the combination of critical honesty and the continuous development of religious thought on Biblical not mediæval lines band themselves together, and think in future less of the

supposed needs of their particular section of the (Reformed) Christian Church, and more of those of students in general, and of the Church that is to be ?

T. K. CHEYNE.

ARCHÆOLOGY AND CRITICISM.

IN all enquiries into the history of a remote past, criticism and archæology generally go hand in hand. They mutually control and further each other, and they ought as a rule to point to similar conclusions. But at present that does not seem to be the case. A slowly widening divergence in the tendency of Archæology and Criticism has been manifesting itself, until they threaten to stand opposite each other as irreconcilable foes. In the main, Archæology has been decisively pushing back the border line of the historic period to always remoter periods. Criticism, on the other hand, has been tending, especially in regard to religious history, to the view that everything before the 4th or 5th century B.C. is so obscure that we must resign ourselves to very partial and conjectural opinions regarding it. The one has manifested a growing tendency to esteem the good faith and accuracy of early tradition and ancient authors always more highly; the other has grown suspicious to such a degree that it admits nothing to be true in these but what it is actually compelled to admit. The extreme results of this latter attitude are seen in Darmesteter's recent declaration that the Zendavesta belongs to an age immediately preceding our era, or to an even later date; in the assertions of some French scholars that the Vedas are not much anterior to Alexander the Great; and in the almost helpless drift of Old Testament critics to a position regarding the dates of Israelite literature which apparently will not be very greatly caricatured in Vernes' view that all the prophetic writings

are the product of the two or three centuries before Christ. It has thus become a very grave and important question which of these opposite tendencies, the tendency to accept ancient tradition and ancient literature, except where they can be disproved or rendered improbable, or the tendency to reject them, except where they can be proved, is the more wholesome and the more likely to be a guide to truth. For students of the Old Testament this is the question of the hour, and in the history of the criticism of the Homeric Poems, and of the Schliemann archæological investigations, I think we may find materials for an approximate if not a decisive answer. Exceptionally good materials for the study of this history have come into the hands of all by the publication of Dr. Schuchardt's summing up and criticism of Schliemann's results in his recent admirable book, *Schliemann's Excavations*, and in Prof. Perrot's luminous articles on Mycenæan civilization in the February number of the *Revue des deux Mondes* for this year. Without pretending to any authority on Hellenic questions, and relying only on the general agreement of Hellenic scholars, I think it may be possible to show that the truth lies with the archæologists, and that as in regard to Homer, so also in regard to the Old Testament, trust, and not distrust, is the justifiable attitude even on purely literary and historic grounds.

I.

A century ago the critical view of the Homeric poems was, for the first time in modern days, advanced by Wolf. In its essence, his contention was that they were not the work of Homer, or of any single author; that they were not, except in a very secondary sense, contemporary with the civilization they describe, so that we could not authoritatively learn from them the state of early Greece, and that their original basis was a number of separate poems, which had

been welded into a whole by an editor at a comparatively late date. As soon as this theory was broached, the bulk of Homeric scholars took position strongly against it, while a minority of younger and more adventurous men welcomed it, and carried it farther than Wolf, who was conservative as well as critical, would have approved. That was in Germany. In England, for the most part, the new theory was disregarded, and long after it had received serious consideration from German scholars it was looked upon by English Hellenists as a merely provincial freak or curiosity. But the conflict between the two views went on unremittingly for years, and bit by bit the critical view made its way. At length, when victory in Germany was practically assured, it began seriously to affect English opinions. When that took place, English scholars followed rapidly in the footsteps of the critical German school, until there was scarcely any Hellenist of repute who did not admit that the homogeneity and contemporaneousness of the Homeric poems could not be maintained. Under these circumstances, opinions could not but vary greatly as to the historic value of the poems. The more sceptical asserted that they had no basis in fact, that there never had been any such Troy as they describe, and that the earliest parts of them were centuries later than the events they professed to narrate. They were, in short, pure works of imagination, in which the background of daily life which was necessary had been supplied by transferring to pre-Dorian times the civilization and the circumstances of the Ionian Greeks in Asia Minor. On the other hand, a very few still held that the poems were in the main the work of one man, were contemporary witnesses as to the state of early Greece, and that all that was doubtful in them could be explained by the supposition of a later edition, which had left the original work practically untouched. But a greater number held a middle position. Admitting the composite character of the

poems, they fell back upon Wolf's original supposition. They asserted that there had been a Homer, who had written a much smaller but connected poem on the subject of the Siege of Troy, and had fixed the outline so that the succeeding writers who filled up this outline felt themselves entirely controlled by it. This was the end of nearly 100 years' debate. Almost every possible combination of hypotheses had been suggested in its course, but opinion had run finally into these three channels, and it seemed as if further progress would be impossible with the materials available, and that no definite, reliable, generally accepted conclusion could be reached.

Just at this point, however, an enthusiastic believer in Homer, Dr. Schliemann, determined to put the matter to the test of excavation. He trusted Homer, believed that his poems, especially the Iliad, rested upon clear and definite acquaintance with ancient days, and that the great twin-poems had been the work of one man. Having, fortunately, acquired enough of money to make him independent of any extraneous aid, he set to work to dig on the very spots which the Homeric poems celebrated as the sites of cities and castles. His first great effort was at Hissarlik on the Troad, which among the people was called Troy, and which in Roman times had been regarded as the site of the famous city. After arduous, and at first almost futile labours, he succeeded in laying bare a series of remains of ancient towns, superimposed one upon the other, dating from Roman times back to a pre-historic period. In the earliest but one of these, he thought he recognised the Troy of Homer, a town as Homer makes Troy to be. But that difficulty has since been set aside. But it was soon pointed out that the remains were far too small for such. According to Schuchardt, what was here found was the citadel or acropolis, containing the palaces of the royal clan with the houses of their retainers, while on the plain below, as

Homer evidently implies when he makes Hector, Il. VI. 392, pass through the *μέγα ἄστυ* before reaching the outer gate, lay the city proper. On the citadel hill were found the remains of a royal palace, nearly resembling the Homeric royal houses, and of gateways of exactly the type to which the Skaian gate belonged—towers through which the roadway passes, with chambers above, from which non-combatants might look down upon the strife. In the plain, again, “every trench dug in the supposed site of the lower city has yielded countless potsherds, similar to those of the first and second cities” on the hill. Moreover, it has been discovered that the buildings on the citadel hill did not perish by slow decay, but were suddenly destroyed by a great conflagration. Everywhere the sun-dried bricks are found burned on the exposed side, and in the ruins of one of the houses the skeleton of a young girl was found, leaning against the wall, covered with wood cinders. Clearly, therefore, the hill of Hissarlik and the plain at its foot had been in very early times the site of an important city, and in its second period the citadel had been defended by “a stately circuit of fortifications protected by gates and towers such as are found on no other site on the Troad or on the Asia Minor coast at so early a date.” At that time, therefore, the city must “have held a prominent position not only on the Troad, but also on the whole of that Asia Minor coast, that is, in the maritime interest of the Archipelago. It was certainly the capital of the country, and on account of its important position in the straits between two seas it would be called upon to enter actively into wider relations.”¹ It was in short a strong piratical and commercial city. Nor is that all that these excavations have revealed. The art of the place, as seen in its architecture, its ornaments, etc., occupies “a middle position between the three great civilizations of the ancient world, the

¹ Schuchardt, p. 90.

Assyro-Babylonian, the Egyptian, and the Greek." From Assyria its builders got their habit of building in sun-dried brick. From Egypt they learned to "scarp" their walls, a practice which originated there. Finally, in form the Trojan gates and palaces entirely correspond with what is found at Tyrus and Mycenæ. As for the ornaments, those of ivory and jade prove intercourse with Central Asia; those of gold are made after the same model as those of Mycenæ; while the shape of some of their finer vessels are distinctly Egyptian. But their "every-day utensils, such as cooking pots, water jars, cups and spoons, are made on the spot." These, with such of their gold ornaments as are not early Greek in style, have a quite individual character. Finally, the relations with Mycenaean art are found only towards the end of the period in which the second city flourished. Everything consequently combines to characterize these "Trojans," if we may so call them, as a people in a transitional stage of culture. They had a wide commerce, but were themselves too long separated from the purely Asiatic races to work in the Asiatic style, and had too recently come into contact with Greece to have fully adopted in all things the Greek manner.

Such is the position of the "Trojans" according to the Schliemann discoveries. We turn now to the Greek side, and find the same or even greater correspondence between the poems and the facts. At Mycenæ, from which the leaders of the expedition against Troy are said to have come, remains of a still more remarkable character have been discovered, including a citadel of immense strength, and a palace of the same character as that discovered at Hissarlik. Evidently here too the ruling clan, with their retainers and dependents, occupied the citadel as their quarter, and had their tombs there. At the foot of the citadel spread the lower city, in which the other clans had their dwelling, each in its own quarter, and with its own burying place, and the

whole remains are of a date which ranges from 1500 B.C. to 1100 B.C. Just as Troy must have stood far above any other city of the time on the shores of Asia Minor, so Mycenæ must have excelled all the cities of Greece at the same time. By its position, too, it received the commerce of both the Corinthian Gulf and of the Southern Mediterranean, and enjoyed a wealth and culture of a most unexpected kind. Mycenæ and Troy, therefore, were political and commercial rivals at this remote time, and it is even conjectured that the piratical habits of the Trojans were the real cause of the Greek attack. Further, in the tombs at Mycenæ were discovered gold ornaments of the greatest value, beautifully wrought, just as the poems describe them, diadems and pendants, crosses and earrings, hairpins and necklaces. There were, too, daggers, inlaid after the manner of the shield of Achilles. On these, hunting scenes were depicted with extraordinary power and truth to life, variously coloured metals being used with marvellous skill. In every respect Homer's account of early Greek art is justified, and what was once regarded as conclusive evidence of late date, is now shown to be an exact statement of what existed at that early time. The discoveries at Mycenæ have put it beyond reasonable doubt that there was here a civilization exactly such as the poems describe, and the conclusion seems inevitable that some of the writers who produced the poems must have lived in that period, or so shortly afterwards that the full details concerning it could be, and were, handed down in a perfectly reliable manner. In other words, these discoveries show that with regard to early Greek life and civilization some portions of these poems have all the value of history, as Prof. Jebb, sceptical and cautious as he is, entirely admits. In early Greece, therefore, before the Dorian invasion, which is generally dated 1100 B.C., there existed along the Eastern shores and in the islands of the Ægean sea, a civilization of a high

kind, yet totally different, and in many respects superior to either the Dorian civilization or that of the Ionian cities of Asia Minor, both of which arose later. In architecture it is superior to the Dorian, for there are no Dorian citadels, and Mycenean art is superior to anything the Dorians did in any later time. On the other hand, it is different from Ionian civilization in this, that while the Ionians were keen and adventurous merchants, entirely democratic in feeling, the Achæians, as we may call the pre-Dorian Greeks, were groups of aristocrats, who cared little for commerce, which they left to the Phœnicians, and lived mainly on the produce of the soil, which their serfs cultivated.

Now these facts are remarkable enough in themselves, but their main importance for us is the general inference which can rightly be drawn from them as to the character of Homer. The first hasty deduction was that in every detail the poems were simply a verifying of history, and that the very castles and treasuries and graves of Priam and Agamemnon had been discovered. But further consideration has shown that no such view is tenable. In many things the poems are imaginative enough, they had not been poems else. As Prof. Jebb has pointed out, if the Achæans are rightly depicted, the Trojans cannot be so, for in manners, customs, thought, and speech, the Trojans differ hardly at all from them. Nevertheless conclusions of a very important kind can be drawn with safety from the results of these excavations. First of all, the poems have preserved a perfectly accurate view of Greek civilization as it existed about 1300 B.C., for the life they describe is pre-Dorian. Secondly, they cannot as a whole have been originally produced in Ionian Asia Minor, for no Ionian Greek could have had such accurate knowledge of pre-Dorian Greek life as they exhibit. Even if such an one had received a tradition of it, he could not have reproduced

it with such truth of detail without an artistic skill and an archæological knowledge which, so far as is known, no one then possessed. But thirdly, there are in the poems many passages which reveal a much later time. Putting aside Mr. Walter Leaf's attractive speculations in his introduction to Schuchardt's volume, as to the possibility of the bulk of the poems having been originally written in an Æolic dialect of an ancient type, and so being possibly contemporaneous with the Mycenean civilization, the only supposition that will meet the case is that the oldest portion of the poems must go back to the Achæan time. Fourthly, seeing that the later parts are in the main true to the Achæan background, the earlier portions must have had a unity and completeness of their own, which drew the lines for later compilers and editors so sharply that they too had to limit themselves by the original outline. There was, therefore, a Homer, who gave to the poems the unity universally felt in them by every poetic and understanding reader, but there has also been conspicuously and effectively at work upon them, a later hand or hands, as the critics always said. The net result, therefore, seems to be that both parties to the discussion in regard to the age and authorship of Homer have been right in what they affirmed, and wrong in what they denied. The traditionalists have been justified in their persistent refusal to believe that the narrative of the poems was a purely baseless and imaginative one, with no relation to the facts of ancient life at all, and in their adherence to the view that there was a unity notwithstanding all diversities which implied one imaginative mind as the first source of the whole. But they were wrong in denying the existence of huge additions and interpolations, and in asserting that the whole poems as they have come down to us, could have been the work of one mind and one period. As a matter of fact the central points of their position can now be maintained only

by admitting that such additions of foreign but related material do exist. For the marks of Ionian influence are so strong that if Homer must be all of one time and from one hand then it must be all of the Ionian time. But the critics are left in no better case. Their scepticism has been proved to be altogether excessive. Much that they regarded as purely imaginative and impossible at so early a date as the Homeric poems were said to belong to has been proved to be simply a most accurate account of the realities of precisely that early time. Their belief that originally there was no unity in the poems at all, that they were simply a mass of separate ballads dealing with the deeds and adventures of separate heroes, into which unity was brought only by the latest editors is rendered in the last degree improbable. Further, their idea that these ancient singers and writers made good their utter ignorance of the past by transferring to it the circumstances of their own time, receives no countenance. But their main contention that there was in the poems too great diversity both of matter and style to permit of the supposition that one author had produced our Homer at one time, has been proved to be true, and their researches have been the means of pouring a flood of light upon the genesis and growth of the immortal work with which they had to do. In fact, it looks as if both the critical and conservative tendencies were justified, the one for its acuteness in noting differences, the other for its firmness in holding fast to that unity which, as a whole, the poems asserted for themselves.

II.

With regard to the critical theories of the Old Testament, the course of things has been very similar. In details, of course, there have been differences, the greater being this, that in the Old Testament criticism has had to do mainly with history and law, while in Homer all has been poetry.

But in broad outline the course of things has been almost parallel. A century ago the critical reaction began here also. At first, too, most students of the Old Testament were hostile, while a minority laboured unweariedly to establish the critical position. Finally, Germany was won for the new views, and at length England tardily entered upon the field. We are now at the stage when English opposition has almost wholly broken down, so far as special and qualified Old Testament scholars are concerned, while the traditional views are still held by the great mass of Bible readers, even among the educated. As to the theories held also, the analogy is close. Here in regard to the Scriptures, as there in regard to Homer, some still hold that Moses actually himself wrote the Pentateuch, that the order of the books as they stand in our Bible is in the main the true one, and that we have written contemporary evidence at least for all that took place in the history of Israel from the time of the Exodus. The critical school of Kuenen and Wellhausen, on the contrary, assert that except the Song of Deborah, we have no contemporary documents before the 9th century B.C., that scarce any Scriptural book is homogeneous, that they have been made up, the prophetic books as well as others, of a number of different documents put together by later editors, that they have been worked over and fitted into each other, and that all they tell us of the legislation, the worship, and the history of Israel, in times before the writing prophets, rests merely on tradition, varied and shot through with details arrived at by transferring to that past all that was thought essential in the present of the various writers and compilers. In that way we are deprived of all reliable documents for the earlier history. For the most part, of late the conflict of opinion has been between these two extreme views, but during the century since criticism began, almost every possible interpretation of the documents has been tried, and no decisive result seemed

likely to emerge. There is, indeed, a middle view which is strongly represented in Britain—a view which accepts the composite character of the Scriptural books, which accepts also the later editors, but which is very slow to believe that the whole of a nation's popular tradition can be disposed of as Wellhausen and Stade dispose of them. Men holding that position are inclined to believe that traditions such as those of the great deliverance from Egypt, of the legislation of Sinai, as to the life and work of Moses, are not mere baseless stories, that they do rest upon authentic facts, that the history of Israel did in those times, and from the hands of Moses, receive an impress which has proved to be essential and permanent, and that we should be much nearer the truth, if that were the choice, in accepting these narratives to their most trifling detail than in rejecting them because of minor difficulties or general presuppositions. But *decisive* facts in their form there were none. But here, too, archæology has come to our aid. As yet the results have been neither so striking nor so decisive as the Schliemann excavations have been. The enormously wider field, the greater complexity of the problem, and the relatively small amount of excavation made, have prevented that. In the main, however, the direction in which the results of excavation point is the same as that of the Schliemann excavations. The evidence of the Assyrian and Egyptian inscriptions has brought the earliest periods of Israel's existence as a nation into the full light of history, and they have given us documents contemporary with every decisive period of Israel's development. Yet the result has been to increase the general confidence in the Scriptural writers as men entirely set upon accuracy so far as that was possible to them. Whatever else they may be or do, they at least write in entire good faith, and, so far, I doubt whether one instance can be cited in which the monuments or inscriptions have favoured the idea that the circumstances of later

times have been transferred to earlier. Moreover the Tel-el-Amarna tablets have shown that writing could easily have been learned, and most probably was learned, by Israel's leading men almost as soon as they came out of the desert, and that in any case there were numerous scribes who could have been hired to make records. It is, therefore, *a priori* likely that official documents belonging to the earliest time may have existed at the time when history began to be written. Further still, in the case of the 14th chapter of Genesis, evidence is accumulating that both as regards the warlike expedition from Babylonia, and the religious character and name of Jerusalem, it gave us the only hint we had as to the true state of things. In short, the whole tendency of discovery here, so far as it has gone, is much the same as we have seen it to be in Greece. Unless, therefore, it should suddenly take a new and unexpected direction, the probabilities are that as in the other case, so in it will be found that the truth has been the exclusive possession of no one school. The adherents of tradition will probably have to admit the heterogeneous and composite character of the Scriptural books, and will not finally be able to maintain the early authorship of the Pentateuch as a whole, or the absence of later interpolations in other books. The critics, on the other hand, will probably have a good deal to retract of what they have written about the untrustworthy character of many books. On the whole, the reliable character of the fundamental lines of Israel's history, as they are given in Scripture, will be confirmed, and the part taken by Moses in the establishment of the polity and religion of Israel will be found to be, not nearly so extensive, perhaps, as tradition would make it, but so intense and decisive that the whole later development was fixed by his action. Those who came after will be seen, most probably, to have only filled up the mould he fashioned. If so, the accuracy of the older view will in sub-

stance be vindicated. If ultimately that should prove to be the case, the Church will have less to revise in her teachings than may have been feared, and the advantage of giving free course to enquiry will once more have been triumphantly manifested. But in any case it must be clear that no greater service to Biblical science could be rendered than to promote new excavations in Biblical lands, and to complete those already begun. Scholarship has all but exhausted the materials at its disposal, and finality seems far off. The spade alone can give us new materials, and we must look to the managers of the Palestine and Egyptian Exploration Funds as our court of final appeal. It is to be hoped that the friends of the Bible will see this, and that these Funds will be supported with sufficient liberality to enable the great work to be carried on, and, if that be possible, completed.

ANDREW HARPER.

*THE WESTERN TEXT OF THE GREEK
TESTAMENT.*

IN the *Codex Beza* of the University of Cambridge we have preserved, according to the judgment of the great critic who has so lately been taken from us, a truer image of the form in which the Gospels and the Acts were most widely read in the third, and probably a great part of the second century, than in any other Greek MS. This is, of course, a very different thing from saying that it comes nearer than any other to the original text. It is evident that an interpolator's hand has been at work on every page. Paraphrases, grammatical expansions, and especially harmonizing corruptions, abound. As Dr. Hort says, "we seem to be in the presence of a vigorous and popular ecclesiastical life, little scrupulous as to the letter of venerated writings, or as to their permanent function in the future, in comparison with supposed fitness for immediate edification." But however little we may trust the distinctively Western readings to guide us in restoring a primitive text, it is obviously a matter of extreme interest that we should get what light we can upon their origin. Professor Rendel Harris, in his recent *Study of the Codex Beza*, has attacked this question with so much learning, ingenuity, and familiarity with textual phenomena, that his explanation deserves to be widely known, and claims to be carefully examined.

The *Codex Beza* has now 406 leaves remaining out of an original total of 534; on the left-hand page of each open leaf appears the Greek text, on the right a Latin version. The first point for critics to decide is, what is the relation between these two? Is the Latin a rendering of the Greek which it faces? Are they derived independently from earlier Greek and Latin archetypes? Or has the Greek

been revised and adapted to the Latin? The third of these possibilities seems at first sight far the least probable. Yet it has at times found considerable support. The charge of Latinizing has been again and again brought against Greek MSS. To pass over the incautious language of scholars like Erasmus and Wetstein, as late as 1857 an Edinburgh Reviewer put it forward in an extravagant form. In Luke xiv. 5, the reading which has overwhelming support in our earliest authorities is *τινος ὑμῶν υἱὸς ἢ βοῦς εἰς φρέαρ πεσεῖται*. The reviewer holds that no one will doubt for an instant that this reading grew up through the intervention of a Latin version. Seeing that the *only* early support (with the exception of \aleph) to be found for *ὄνος ἢ βοῦς* is derived from Latin or Latinized sources, it is rather bold to assume that the alternative reading, universal in texts free from this influence, is due to it. But if limited to the bilingual MSS., the charge of Latinizing is not *a priori* absurd; and it has been advanced by scholars of eminence. Dr. John Mill, for instance, quoted seven or eight instances in which he thought it was evident that the Greek text of Δ ¹ had been altered under the influence of the Latin; and Wetstein, as might be expected, supported him. Michaelis replied to them with some force, and not long afterwards the question was for a time laid to rest by the emphatic and weighty judgment of Griesbach. He did not altogether deny the possibility of occasional forms or glosses slipping in from the Latin; but he contended that these are of slight importance, and accidental; and denied the existence of any systematic adaptation. Bishop Marsh too contended that there was no "Latinizing" reading in Δ which might not as well be a genuine reading of the Greek. On the other hand, Bishop Middleton found, as he thought, clear evidence of Latinizing corruption, which he arranged under

¹ It will be convenient in this paper to use Δ for the Greek text of *Codex Bezae* (commonly denoted *D*), and *D* for the Latin text (commonly denoted *d*).

eight distinct grammatical heads. But his evidence, carefully as it was marshalled, did not produce general conviction. Tischendorf, it is true, spoke of Δ as entirely dependent on D; but probably Dr. Hort more truly represented the current opinion, when he spoke of "the whimsical theory of the last century, which maintained that the Western Greek text owed its peculiarities to translation from the Latin," and elsewhere of "the genuine Old Latin text, which has been altered throughout into verbal conformity with the Greek text by the side of which it was intended to stand."

Now against this prevalent doctrine Mr. Harris's *Study* is an emphatic and elaborate protest. "If New Testament criticism," he says, "is to progress with any confidence, we must retire in order to advance; we must go back again to positions clearly defined by Mill and Wetstein, deserting the theories which underlie the majority of the texts published in later days." It may be doubted whether his practice would be quite so revolutionary as these words seem to indicate. At any rate so far he has not directly assaulted the general critical principles of scholars like Lachmann and Tregelles; nor do his researches bear very dangerously even against the more dubious theory of the Syrian recension put forward by Bishop Westcott and Dr. Hort. What he claims to have shown is that the Western text, not in Δ only, but also as represented in some of the earlier versions, has largely Latinized; and that it is to this source, rather than to the accumulated effects of the free handling of which Dr. Hort writes, that its peculiarities are due. But to whatever cause the deviation is owing, Mr. Harris is at one with other critics as to the existence of a deviation from the primitive text; and this is the practically important point. His theory as to the origin and course of this deviation is not stated at the outset, but is allowed to reveal itself in the course of the investigation; and the enquiry is at times retarded by digressions as to the

phonetics, morphology, and syntax of the Latin version, which have but a remote bearing on the main question ; and which, therefore, interesting as they are, might perhaps have been better relegated to an appendix. But the outcome of the inquiry is somewhat as follows : that a primitive translation of the Gospels and Acts into Latin was made, probably at Carthage, early in the second century, from a text already marked by a few Western readings, now preserved to us in the *Codex Ephraemi* ; that this was in use at Rome about A.D. 160-170, and was there largely corrupted by Montanist glosses in Luke and Acts, and by Marcionite corruptions (possibly even earlier) in the other Gospels ; that before this date two or three distinctive readings had been introduced by a Homeric centonist, and the text with these additions used for a primitive Syriac version ; and that after the introduction of the Montanist element the text was employed for the Theban version. Then, Mr. Harris holds, in the bilingual MSS. the text of the Greek was freely corrected, so as to correspond with the Latin version, which had been so modified.

Some of these points the author himself considers problematical, and confessedly they rest on but slight evidence ; others he thinks that he has firmly established. If this is the case for only a part of his results, we must accept his *Study* as one of the most interesting, and possibly important, of recent contributions to New Testament criticism.

Before any attempt is made to consider the nature and the strength of the evidence which Mr. Harris adduces, it may be well to inquire what is the value of that on which the commonly accepted view is based. Dr. Scrivener tries to prove (1) that the Latin version is on the whole an independent translation, made either directly from the Greek on the opposite page, or from a text almost identical with

it; (2) that the translator often retained in his memory, and perhaps occasionally consulted, both the old Latin version and Jerome's revised Vulgate; (3) that he probably executed his work in Gaul about the close of the fifth century. Each of these three propositions Mr. Harris considers an error. "The translation was not made from the Greek text as now read in the MS., for this has been harmonized with the Latin. The translator not merely remembers the Old Latin version; he is himself the author of it, and the reference to Jerome is probably a delusion. Last of all, the translation is much older than the fifth century."

What then are Dr. Scrivener's arguments for deriving the Latin version from the Greek text which faces it? First, he says, how else shall we account for the frequent insertion in the Latin of purely Greek words, which no other version ever employed, and for which there are adequate equivalents in Latin? He quotes such words as *aporia*, and the still more barbarous *aporiari*, *allophylus*, *spermologus*, *eremum*, and the like. Secondly, no other version is quite so grossly ungrammatical in its defiance of the rules of syntax, having such imitations of the Greek as a genitive absolute, a neuter plural with a singular verb, a genitive after a comparative, a double negative increasing the negative force, constructions of verbs following the Greek and not the Latin usage, and dozens of other cases of the kind. Thirdly, and more conclusive still, are the many instances where the Latin has a false reading which is plainly derived from some error in a Greek MS., though one not now found in Δ ; e.g. *verbum* answers to $\nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\varsigma$, where the original evidently had $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, *sacrificare* to $\theta\upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\sigma\alpha\iota$ (as if $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\iota$), *in ipso iudicio* to $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\acute{\omega}\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\ \kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$, *sindon nuditatis* to $\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu\delta\omicron\nu\alpha\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\ \gamma\upsilon\mu\mu\omicron\upsilon$, *possidens in timore* to $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omega\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \phi\acute{o}\beta\omega$, and very many similar cases. Finally, the present Latin often differs from the Greek by an error,

which has evidently arisen in the Latin; e.g. ἠγάπησαν rendered by *dixerunt* (for *dilexerunt*), παραθεωροῦντο by *discupiuntur* for *dispiciuntur*, ἐχθές by *externa* (for *hesterna*) die, ῥαβδούχους by *lectores* (for *lictiores*), and the like.

But we must observe exactly how far this evidence takes us. The first group of facts proves that the version was made from a text containing many Greek words occurring in Δ , which no one would question for a moment, and also that either D was made independently of the other Old Latin versions, or, the latter were revised and more familiar Latin words substituted for the Greek words retained in D. Obviously either supposition would satisfy the conditions of the problem, which must be solved otherwise. The same may be said of the second group of facts. That D adheres more closely to the form of its original than many, perhaps than any, of the other versions is evident; that this original was Δ , or "a text almost identical with it," is not in any way shown. The third group is collected to show that Δ is not dependent on D; it shows almost as clearly that D, as we have it, is not dependent on Δ . At least there is nothing to show that the misreading of the Greek was a result of translating from Δ rather than at any earlier stage. And this seems proved to a certainty by the fact that there are several cases where D has the correct reading, while Δ is corrupt; e.g. Matthew xi. 3, σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐργαζόμενος ἢ ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν, where the Latin is *tu es qui venis aut alium expectamus*; or Luke ii. 14, πλήθος στρατείας οὐρανοῦ αἰτούντων τὸν θεόν (for αἰνούντων D *laudantes*); with others quite as significant.

Taken along with the cases of the fourth group, these show us quite clearly that there has been no systematic attempt to assimilate either Δ or D to the other; there are in both corruptions which must have been subsequent to any such attempt, if it was ever made. We are of necessity thrown back upon an earlier stage. But if it is held that at some

earlier stage the Greek text was assimilated to the Latin, in such a way as to deprive its testimony of independent value, while not excluding a reciprocal influence on D as we have it now, I find nothing in Dr. Scrivener's arguments in any way fatal to such a view. It is admitted, of course, that the original of the Gospels and Acts was in Greek; hence no amount of Hellenisms in the Latin version will surprise us; they will be simply indications of what we know already. They will prove that D is derived from a Greek text, but not that it is derived from Δ . On the other hand any clearly marked Latinisms in Δ will be strong evidence that they came from the influence of the Latin version (though probably a stage or two back), for we know of no other source to which we can so plausibly assign them. In symbols we may say that a Greek text a may have been translated into a Latin a , that a bilingual $a + a$ came into the hands of a copyist, who produced $\beta + b$, where β is a modified by a , and b may also have suffered from assimilation, and that $\beta + b$ was the mediate or immediate parent of $\Delta + D$, *i.e.* our present *Codex Bezae*. All this is, of course, pure conjecture, The theory is consistent with the facts put together by Dr. Scrivener, but so might half-a-dozen other hypotheses be. We have to consider whether there is any more definite evidence as to the way in which the problem must be solved.

The first piece of evidence, which Mr. Harris adduces, comes out incidentally. In John xxi. 22, Δ has *εαν αυτον θελω μενειν ουτως*; D, *si cum volo sic manere: ουτως* and *sic* have no authority in any other MS. The obvious thing is to suppose that *ουτως* crept in from a remembrance of the *εκαθέζετο ουτως = sedebat sic* of John iv. 7. But Jerome's Vulgate reads *sic eum volo manere*, and there are traces of this in other Old Latin sources. Mr. Harris calls attention to two other places in which *sic* appears, where we expect *si*, and finds in this a retention of the archaic *sic* for *si*,

sometimes used by Plautus. From this he argues that a marginal gloss has found its way into our text, not however expelling, but only displacing the original *sic*. If we accept this theory, two immensely important consequences follow: first, that the Greek text Δ has, at least in this instance, Latinized; and second, that the Latin versions are derived from a common source, for it is not likely that independent translators should agree in retaining this archaism. But one or two points require to be noticed. Mr. Harris says "the Western text has Latinized"; but there is no trace of this reading in any Greek MS. except Δ, and it is not universal even in the Latin versions. Then again the question whether a Plautine archaism like *sic* for *si* could have been retained in the popular Latin of the time of the version deserves fuller consideration than it has as yet received. Mr. Harris has quoted some interesting instances from the Latin translation of Irenæus, in which *sic* is found in the best MSS. where the sense seems to require *si*, but the inquiry is not carried far enough to be convincing. And there is always the possibility of the other alternative, that of a gratuitous insertion of the word, being the true explanation.

The next instance is from Luke xxiii. 53. After the ordinary reading *και εθηκεν αυτον εν μνημειω λελατομημενω ου ουκ ην ουπω ουδεις κειμενος* Δ goes on *και θεντος αυτου επεθηκε τω μνημειω λειθον ου μογισ εικοσι εκυλιον*. D has *et posito eo imposuit in monumento lapidem quem vix viginti movebant*. The interpolation is puzzling enough; it looks at once like a reminiscence of the huge stone, which twenty-two waggons would not have stirred, that Polyphemus rolled to the door of his cave; but how did it come in here? Is the Latin or the Greek to blame? Omitting two redundant phrases, we have in Latin *imposuit lapidem quem vix viginti movebant*, which reveals itself at once as an attempt at a hexameter, though a rather lame one. In Greek there is

not a trace of metre. This seems to indicate pretty clearly that the words were inserted in the Latin and afterwards passed into the Greek. Mr. Harris weakens his case by accepting a suggestion that the line may have come from the ancient version of the Odyssey by Livius Andronicus. I think he is in error in supposing that there are any traces of hexameters in this version, all the extant fragments being plainly in Saturnians;¹ and it is inconceivable that any early writer should have so shortened the final syllable of *viginti*. (The marking of the quantity in Lewis and Short is carelessly retained from Forcellini, and is quite unwarranted). Probably the Latin scribe attempted a rendering of a Homeric line for himself. A striking fact is that this same addition is found in the Theban version, an indication that there was a close connexion between this version and the text from which Δ was derived. But it must not be overlooked that we have an intermediate stage, between the reading of Δ and that of most MSS. here, in those which introduce into Luke the clause from Matthew (xxvii. 60) *προσκυλίσας λίθον μέγαν τῇ θύρᾳ τοῦ μνημείου* (cf Mark xv. 46), and that it is perfectly possible that the interpolation passed through some such stage as this. In any case if the Theban version is rightly ascribed to the second century, we find here another of those textual phenomena which are quite fatal to any late date for our Gospels.

A third line of argument has been drawn from the fact that words seem to have been dropped from the Greek, though really needed for the sense, in order to keep up a verbal equality with the Latin. In Luke xv. 28, *ὁ δὲ πατήρ αὐτοῦ ἐξελθὼν παρεκάλει αὐτόν*, D has *pater autem eius exiens rogabat eum*, but most of the Latin versions have like the Vulgate *cœpit rogare eum*: Δ has *ο δε πατηρ αυτου εξελθων ηρξατο αυτον*. It is evident that *παρακαλεῖν* has

¹ The three marked as hexameters in Bishop Wordsworth's *Specimens* are better treated by Dr. Merry, pp. 9, 10.

been dropped at the end of the line. Is this due merely to accident? Mr. Harris thinks that it was lost because there was nothing to balance it in the Latin. But this does not explain the origin of either of the readings: ἤρξατο παρακαλεῖν may very well have been suggested by *carpit rogare*, which is natural enough as a rendering of παρακάλει; but how is it that D has given up the reading of the other versions, supported as it was by the Greek facing him, and taken to *rogabat*? This is an interesting instance, showing at the same time that there are phenomena in Δ not to be explained from anything in D, and that the copyist of D did not himself translate from Δ, *i.e.* that Dr. Scrivener's theory obviously needs much qualification.

In Acts vi. 14, ἀλλαξει τα εθνη is translated *mutabit iterum*: Bentley suggested that here the translator mistook εθνη for ετι; Mr. Harris thinks it more probable that *mutabit iterum* translates ἀλλαξει, and that some word like *consuetudines* was dropped at the end for the sake of symmetry. Seeing, by the way, that the relative which follows is *quos*, it would have been better to conjecture *mores*. This is doubtful. But much stronger evidence is given by a group of instances in which a word quite needless in Greek has been added without any apparent reason, except to balance the Latin, *e.g.* Matt. xi. 28, δευτε προς με παντες οι κοπιωντες και πεφορτισμενοι εσται, where the last word (by itacism for εσπε) can have no other origin than the Latin *qui laboratis et onerati estis*. A single instance of this kind goes far to show that Latinizing is a *vera causa*, but it needs careful consideration to decide whether it has been the *causa efficiens* in any particular case. In Mark viii. 2, Mr. Harris argues that the original reading was, as in B, οτι ημεραι τρισιν προσμενουσι μοι, that the Latin translator rendered *quoniam iam triduum est ex quo hic sunt*, that then the attempt was made to turn *triduum est* literally into Greek, giving us ἡμέραι τρεῖς εἰσίν: and that

finally *ex quo hic sunt* has been restored verbatim to the Greek, giving us Δ 's fearful and wonderful *οτι ηδη ημεραι τρεις εισιν απο ποτε ωδε εισιν*. But how does this theory suit the intermediate stages? All MSS. except B give us *ημεραι τρεις* or *ημερας τρεις*: but there is not a trace of the *ex quo hic sunt* except in D and some other Latin versions. How are we to suppose that all the Greek uncials but B were influenced by the first half of the Latin translation and not one by the latter? Even Westcott and Hort do not venture to place *ημέραις τρισίν* in their text; and the temptation to alter an ungrammatical nominative must have been very strong. It is not to be overlooked that in Matt. xv. 32, all the good MSS. (including B) have *ημεραι τρεις*, where there can be no question of Latinizing. In this instance there seems to be a corruption in Δ and D originating in Δ : the former has *ηδη ημεραι γ. εισιν και προσμενουσιν μοι*, the latter *jam tres dies sunt et sustinent me*. Now *jam tres dies sustinent me* would present no difficulty in Latin, but *ημεραι τρεις προσμενουσιν* would suggest correction. In Luke xv. 24 Mr. Harris supposes that *απολωως* lost its *ην* in order to correspond better to *perierat*, but the very strong evidence for the omission of *ην* in v. 32 makes us doubt this explanation. Still, there are a good many readings of this kind in Δ , of which it is not only a possible but also a probable account that they are due to an endeavour to make the Greek text more parallel to the Latin. There are no data at present for determining the period at which this endeavour was made; but it was clearly at some stage between the original translation and the transcription as we now have it.

Mr. Harris next proceeds to gather evidence of Latini-
zing from a wider range. His first case is not a strong
one. In Luke i. 78 MSS. vary between *επισκεψατο* and
επισκεψεται. Here he assumes that the difference is due to
a confusion between *visitabit* and *visitavit*: of course the

confusion was a constant one, but hardly more common than that in Greek MSS. between the future and the aorist ; and to assign this as the cause here is to assume not merely that all uncials but \aleph B L have gone wrong, which critics often have to say, but also that they have been all misled by a Latin version, which is a much more doubtful proposition. In Luke xiv. 5., Tregelles long ago made it clear that *προβατον* of Δ could not have been the original reading from which through *ovis* came *υίός*. Mr. Harris's suggestion that in D *ovis* is due to the subsequent *bobis* either as a dittograph or as a correction, is more plausible but not necessary, seeing how common is the combination *πρόβατον ἢ βοῦς* (cf. Matt. xii. 11). In some of the cases where Mr. Harris supposes that the translation of *δέ* by *et* has reacted by producing in Δ a *καὶ—δέ*, there seems good authority for thinking the latter genuine ; e.g. in Mark vi. 21 it is surely *δέ* (which is found only in Δ^* (*a, b, c*)) that should be erased, not *καὶ*, which appears in all our authorities. In Mark viii. 29, where the true reading is *καὶ αὐτός*, Δ has *αυτος δε*, D *ipse autem* : which looks like the earlier variation ?

It was pointed out long ago that the Latin translator had been puzzled how to deal with the Greek definite article, and had tried various renderings (cp. Scrivener's *Cod. Bez.*, p. 33). Mr. Harris well shows what confusion this has at times produced in the Greek text, culminating in the extraordinary *ο κοσμος τουτος* of John xvii. 25. But if, as he thinks, *τούτου* in Mark viii. 2 is due to *istam* of D, the corruption has spread far in the Western text : it is noteworthy, by the way, that Δ alone of Greek MSS. has the genitive *επι του οχλου*, all others having the accusative. If the case had been reversed, this would certainly have been quoted as an instance of Latinizing. In Matthew ix. 26 *εξηλθεν η φημη αυτη* appears in C 1, 33, Memph., as *εξηλθεν η φημη αυτης* : this Mr. Harris takes as the original

Western text, and assumes that *αυτης* became *eius* in the Latin version, and then *αυτου* in Δ . If so, how is it that all the Latin texts have *haec*? Are we to suppose that the Western reading was corrected away? In dealing with Matthew xiv. 6 Mr. Harris is on slippery ground. The true reading is *ωρχήσατο ἡ θυγάτηρ τῆς Ἑρωδιάδος*; Δ gives *ωρχησατο η θυγατηρ αυτου Ηρωδίας*, which seems historically impossible. Mr. Harris suggests that *τῆς Ἑρωδιάδος* was rendered *eius Herodiadis*, that *eius* was taken as masculine, and so translated *αὐτοῦ*, and that this involved the further change to *Ἑρωδιάς*. But it must be observed (1) that there is no trace of *eius* in D, which has simply *filia Herodiadis* (thus markedly departing from Δ); (2) that there seems to be no case of the article before a proper name being rendered by *is*, though *hic* and *ille* are common enough; (3) that in the parallel passage Mark vi. 22 *τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἑρωδιάδος* is found in $\aleph B L \Delta$, and two other MSS. as well as in D, and is actually adopted by Westcott and Hort, in spite of Scrivener's protest (*Introd.*, p. 544). Whatever cause led to the adoption of this reading in Mark by MSS. of such high authority, which, if any, have escaped from Latinizing, may also have brought it into Δ in Matthew.

On the other hand, in Matthew xviii. 20, if we set down these readings: B *οὐ γάρ εἰσιν δύο ἢ τρεῖς συνηγμένοι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα ἐκεῖ εἰμὶ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν*: D *non enim sunt duo aut tres collecti apud quos non ero in medio eorum*: Δ *οὐκ εἰσιν γὰρ δυο η τρεις συνηγμενοι εις το εμον ονομα παρ οις ουκ ειμει εν μεσω αυτων*, there does not seem to be much doubt that the corruption began by a Latin translator, who confused *οὐ* with *οὐ̄*. Of course it is just possible to maintain that a careless Greek copyist made the error, to avoid the possibility of which Origen often quotes the verse with *όπου* substituted; but the probability lies in the other direction.

In some cases Mr. Harris ascribes to Latin influence

grammatical constructions which are due rather to the laxity of declining Greek; e.g. ἀκούειν is followed by the genitive in other cases besides Acts xi. 7, and in Acts iii. 25 ἦν need not be defended by Latin usage. There may have been some assimilation, but there is certainly far more in the Latin text than in the Greek. In Acts v. 3, where Δ has πρὸς Ἀνανίαν, this is very possibly due to the mistake of a Latin translator, who took *Anania* for a dative, and rendered *ad Ananian*; but this reading is so natural in itself that it may have been spontaneous. It is not possible to lay much stress on the confusion between aorists and imperfects, nothing being more common in any Greek MS. [the Vaticanus in Thuc. viii. is always going wrong thus], nor does one see what was the inducement to translate a Greek aorist by a Latin imperfect, as Mr. Harris thinks to have been often the case. In Luke viii. 27 ἐνεδύσατο may be the earlier reading, but why suppose that ἐνεδιδύσκετο of all Uncials but four and of Syriac versions is due to an assumed *induebatur*? Or why set down the very natural ἔκραζον of Mark xv. 14 (adopted, though doubtless wrongly, by Lachmann) to *clamabant*? In Matthew xxvii. 23, ἔκραζον is found in all MSS. but Δ: here D retains *clamabant*, and yet Δ has capriciously altered it; why may it not have been so in many other cases? In Matthew iv. 8, ἔδειξεν looks very much like a misunderstanding of *ostendit*; yet v. 5 may give us pause. Here ἔστησεν corresponds to *statuit*; but it is supported against ἵστησιν by \aleph BCDZ, so that it must be genuine, and it may well have brought ἔδειξεν after it. We may more confidently ascribe μίσει of Δ in John xvii. 14 to *odit*; but it must be noticed that there are no aorists in the context, so that ἐμίσησεν may perhaps have been intentionally changed.

Of the numerous instances where Δ has the Latin idiom of two finite verbs and a copula instead of a participle and a finite verb, many may fairly be ascribed to Latinizing. But

the question may arise here, as in similar cases, whether the Latinizing was not due quite as much to the fact that the copyist was familiar with Latin idioms, as to the influence of the attached version. In Matthew xiii. 4 *καὶ ἦλθον τὰ πετεινὰ καὶ κατέφαγεν* is supported by all MSS. but B, which has *ἐλθόντα*: must we admit that D has corrupted every other authority, as Mr. Harris says? The case is much the same with Matthew xvii. 7 & B alone escaping; and in Luke xv. 23 where Δ has *ενεγκατε* the quasi-Latinized reading *φέρετε* has much better support than *ἐνέγκαντες*, so cancelling the argument that might be drawn from Δ's *φάγωμεν*. In John xii. 3 we have a perplexing case: *λαβοῦσα λίτραν . . . ἤλειψεν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ* appears in Δ as *λαμβανι λειτραν . . . και ηλειψεν*, which points to *accipit libram—et unxit*; but D gives *accipiens . . . et unxit*. Why should the reviser have gone back to the participial construction after the translator had abandoned it, when there was nothing any longer in the Greek to suggest it? There seems some confusion in the text of other Latin versions here. In five or six other cases we have the participle left in Δ but a *καὶ* introduced to answer to the Latin *et*; Mark vii. 25, xi. 2, xiv. 63, xvi. 14; Acts xiv. 6 are indisputable instances.

A. S. WILKINS.

(To be concluded.)

THE SADDUCEES AND IMMORTALITY.

MARK XII. 18-27.

THE Sadducees are briefly described in this passage as persons who say that there is no resurrection. When a creed is characterized by its negations, we do not look for much originality or enthusiasm in its adherents, and the main interest we can have in it is to understand the moral temper to which its peculiar negations are congenial; in the present case, to understand the leaven of the Sadducees. It is not too misleading to speak of them as the rationalistic party among the Jews. They affected Greek culture, and emancipation from the bigotry and prejudices of their countrymen. They were friendly enough to religion as an institution, but did not understand it as a spirit and a life. Hence they maintained the law, but undervalued the prophets, and distrusted the larger faith and larger hopes which the progress of revelation had brought to Israel. They filled the high priesthood, and most of the dignified places in the Temple service, but were jealous of what they would have called superstition and fanaticism, of what others would call religious faith and earnestness. They had the political concerns of the people to manage, and this helped to foster a worldly, accommodating temper. On the whole they took life in a positivist spirit. "It is what we see," they seem to have said, "and we see it all. We will take it for all it is worth, but indulge no illusions about anything beyond." It is not surprising that such men came less in contact with Jesus than the Pharisees, nor can we wonder that when they did assail Him in the last days

of His life it was with an insolent mockery which showed how secure they were in their unbelief. He was no Sadducee. He believed in heaven, in the angels, in a blessed immortality, and they thought they could discomfit Him before the people.

They came and told the story of the seven brothers who had all in succession, in obedience to the Mosaic law, married the same woman, and they asked: In the resurrection, whose wife shall she be? The question is assumed to be unanswerable; and the argument implied is, that no doctrine can be believed which confronts us with such impossible situations. At first one is tempted not to take it seriously. We see that the difficulty is an artificial one; although the Sadducees in Matthew say, "There were *with us* seven brethren," we do not believe them. No doubt also it was a familiar one, and had been brought to its present perfection of difficulty and absurdity by constant improvement. Plainly, too, the Pharisees had found it an insoluble one, which had left the laugh in many a dispute on the Sadducean side. But the laugh is not much to have on your side, and in such a case only a Sadducee will want it. Where such great interests are involved as the character of God, and the nature and destiny of man, to appeal to ridicule is to show an utter incapacity for understanding. They are not things to be amused about.

Jesus, for His part, answers quite seriously. Do ye not therefore err? He says. The meaning of "therefore" (*διὰ τοῦτο*) has been disputed. It is often read in an anticipative sense, as if Jesus meant: Are you not misled for this reason, that you are ignorant of the Scriptures and of the power of God? Weiss says this has no analogy in the New Testament. However this may be, it is certainly more natural, and yields a deeper and more apposite meaning, to make the words retrospective. The very question of the Sadducees—the very fact that they have stated such a monstrous

case—shows, not that the life of the world to come is totally incredible, but that they have totally misconceived it. They have assumed that it must simply reproduce this life, and renew all its relations; whereas, according to Jesus, it is so constituted (ver. 25) that questions involving these relations, in certain aspects, can never arise there at all. Marriage has its roots in nature, has reference to the succession of generations on earth, is what it is, so far, because of man's mortality; but where there is no death, there is no marrying nor giving in marriage, and therefore the question is inept.

This, of course, is not to be misunderstood, as if in the life to come there would be no relation, or no peculiar relation, between those who have been intimately connected here. All it denies is that there will be any natural relation out of which the difficulty of the Sadducees could arise. But what of that? Even on earth, that which is merely natural ought to pass, and in every true marriage actually passes, into something spiritual. Husband and wife not only become one flesh, but one mind, one soul, one spirit. This relation, which has grown out of the other, or into which the other has been raised and transfigured, does not perish with it; on the contrary, it is capable of immortality and destined for it. The man and the woman who, to borrow St. Paul's words, "are not without each other in the Lord" here, will not be without each other in the Lord there. They will owe the completeness of their Christian life to each other even in the resurrection world. This truth, which cannot be touched by the vulgar puzzle of the Sadducees, ought to be noted in all its generality. A natural relation, whatever it may be—of husband and wife, of parent and child, of brothers and sisters in the same family—has no necessary permanence. All experience shows this. Such relations either lapse into nothingness,—a shocking phenomenon, but by no means rare,—or by God's blessing

are elevated into spiritual ones, which have the capacity and the promise of immortality in them. One of the best blessings which the faith in immortality brings is its hallowing influence on the natural affections. It begins at the very beginning that transformation of them which secures to us their joy for ever.

But Jesus not only declares, he explains the error of the Sadducees. They were the enlightened people of their day, and despised the believers as fanatics and obscurantists, but it was on their own side that the darkness lay. Doubt should be humble, and there is a severe reproof in the words of our Lord: Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.

Here our Saviour clearly teaches that the Scriptures, meaning of course the Old Testament, contain a revelation of immortality. It may not lie on the surface, nor be visible to a careless or Sadducean reader, but it is there. If Jesus saw it, as He did, it is idle for verbal interpreters to say that they cannot find it in so many words. The very scripture that Jesus quotes has been the subject of pedantic comment. "Have ye not read in the book of Moses, at the bush, how God said to him, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? He is not the God of the dead, but of the living." What kind of logic, it is said, have we here? Plainly the words mean, "I am He who *was* the God of Abraham," and then the argument for immortality is gone. To lay stress on the present tense (*I am* the God) is inadmissible, if for no other reason than that the verb is not expressed either in Greek or Hebrew idiom. But this line of objection is beside the mark. Jesus does not argue from the tenses, like a grammarian, but from the spiritual relations involved in the case; the revelation of immortality is made in this, that God has pledged Himself to man to be his God. The goodness and faithfulness of our Creator, and the value of our

human life to Him: it is there that the promise lies. Faith in immortality is an immediate inference from faith in God. Once we know what He is to man, and what man is to Him, eternal hope is born. Because He lives, they who are His shall live also. Can we exhaust the friendship of God in seventy years? Or, on the other hand, can we believe that He really loves us, takes pains to guide us, to teach us, to discipline our character, to raise us from natural into spiritual life, to make us His children, only that at the end of so short a time he may let souls so dear to Him, that have so loved Him and been so loved, that have cost so much, go out into the dark, and never miss them? No, God is not so loveless, and cannot be so bereaved. Neither death nor life will pluck His children out of His hand.

This is the spirit in which Jesus reads the Scriptures, and finds in them a revelation of immortality. And it is remarkable that wherever the great hope comes clearly to the surface in the Old Testament, it is in this spiritual connection. "Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him." When a man has walked with God, this is the only possible issue of his life. *God* takes him; not nature, not disease, not an accident, not death, but He whose friendship gave life the promise of eternity. And so repeatedly in the Psalms. "I am continually with Thee; Thou hast holden my right hand." Here is the experience of God's friendship, close, uninterrupted, and faithful, which works the supreme hope, and the hope shines out in what immediately follows. "Thou shalt guide me with Thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory." The writer of these words argues precisely as Jesus does in the passage before us; he feels that what God is to man—God who is from everlasting to everlasting—is so great, so tender, so divine a thing, that even death cannot touch it. In the last darkness he can say, "I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me." We find, too, the same interpretation of the same sub-

ject in that magnificent passage in Hebrews (xi. 13-16), the boldest in expression of any in the New Testament, which speaks of the faith of the patriarchs. "Now they desire a better country, that is, a heavenly; wherefore God is not ashamed of them, to be called their God, for He hath prepared for them a city." It is God, the writer means, whose faithful love, experienced all through this life, calls forth in the hearts of His people a hope which goes beyond life; it is God's present goodness which has the promise of an immeasurable, inexhaustible goodness as yet unseen. And God dare not frustrate the hope He has Himself inspired. He would be ashamed to be called our God, if He led His people to live and die in an expectation that was never to be fulfilled. Christ tells us, for His part, that He would not have suffered an illusory hope to root itself in His disciples' hearts. "In My Father's house are many mansions; *if it were not so, I would have told you.*" The whole argument for immortality is there; it is God who inspires the hope, and God is faithful.

We see, then, how strong it can be, and in a manner we see its limits. In its full Scripture sense it is the hope of the friends of God. It is they who are accounted worthy to obtain that world. Conceivably, immortality might be a dread as well as a hope; but only one who could wish there were no God could wish that death ended all. It is a hope to those who walk with God, who can say all their life long, "I am continually with Thee," and at the last, "Into Thy hands I commend my spirit." It is a hope to be kept alive in God's company by strenuous spiritual effort, by fighting the good fight, and purging out the leaven of the Sadducees. It is difficult only as everything is difficult which raises life to a higher level, and connects it more closely with God.

Blindness to the revelation made in the Scriptures, and in the faith and experience of God's people, is the first cause of the Sadducean denial. The other is ignorance of God's

power, or what a psalmist calls "limiting the Holy One of Israel." The Sadducees looked upon Nature and the visible constitution of things, and made them the measure of the resources of God. They saw signs of power indeed, but of power perfectly well defined. They saw birth and death in endless alternation; the generations of men, as of all living creatures, each continually displaced by the next; but in all the immensity of Nature they saw nothing abiding in one stay. Under present conditions, immortality was clearly impossible; and as they could not imagine other conditions congruous to such a conception, they denied it outright.

This is one of the most powerful sceptical motives at the present time. The current scientific conception of Nature, at least in its effect upon the imagination, is that of a self-contained system of forces, beyond which there is nothing. It not only illustrates, but defines the power of God. When we know it, we know the limits of His action, the possibilities within His reach. It is against this idea that Jesus enters His protest. All we see in Nature, all we ever can see, is, as Job says, but the outskirts of His ways: how small a whisper do we hear of Him! but the thunder of His power who can understand? Neither our senses, nor our imagination working on the materials supplied by sense, can measure the resources of God; His power transcends imagination and experience alike. Christians, indeed, ought not to be so easily imposed upon in this matter as Jews. If we know more of the immensity of Nature, we know more also of the power of God. The resurrection and exaltation of Jesus, and the revelation of a new mode of man's being in His glorified life, have permanently enlarged our conception of what God can do. This is so much the case that in the New Testament these two ideas are habitually connected: God Almighty is really a synonym of God that raiseth the dead. The Christian assurance of immortality is in the last resort this, that the *power* which worketh in us is the same with

which God wrought in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places (Eph. i. 19, 20). A Christian, therefore, is not put out when he is told that the whole analogy of Nature is against immortality. The truth is obviously so, but it has nothing to do with his faith. He believes in immortality, on the one hand, because man is not merely a piece of Nature, but the friend of God, and on the other, because the power of God can sustain man's being in other modes than the present physical one—modes of which a glimpse at least has been given in the exaltation of Jesus.

We cannot help being struck with the repetition, in our Lord's closing words to the Sadducees, of the assertion that they are in error, greatly in error: *πολὺ πλανᾶσθε*. There is an indignant ring in this abrupt, emphatic iteration, and we feel through it how Jesus resented the degradation of God's character, and of man's nature and destiny, involved in such a question as the Sadducees had put, and in such a tone of mind as had contrived it. Jesus stood there in the world representing at once the goodness and faithfulness of God, and the supreme hope of humanity, ready within a few hours to lay down His life for God and man; and it wounded Him cruelly to meet men who made these high and priceless things a subject for ribald jesting. We are often told that feeling ought to be kept out of argument; and so it should be, except in cases where it is itself an argument, and the supreme one. There are subjects in which the touchstone of an argument is the impression it makes on a good and honest heart, and of these immortality is one. To argue it without feeling is to argue it without comprehension. To argue it without a deep impression of the greatness of man, and the power, the condescension, and the faithfulness of God, is to put the truth out of our reach. The indignant resentment of Jesus, as we catch it in these last words,—you are far astray indeed—shows us the pro-

found importance it had for Him. Schleiermacher thought there was such a thing as an impious laying claim to immortality. It may be that there is; but if we are in sympathy with Jesus, we will not agree with the extension of Schleiermacher's doctrine by a later theologian, viz., that there is such a thing as a pious resignation of immortality. It is enough for the disciple that he be as his Master.

JAMES DENNEY.

THE WESTERN TEXT OF THE GREEK
TESTAMENT.

II.

IN dealing with the difficult *ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιεν* of Mark xiv. 72, where D has *et coepit flere*, Mr. Harris suggests that the Latin is only intended to render *ἔκλαιεν*, and that this was turned back into Greek as *ἠρξάτο κλαιειν* in Δ, *επιβαλων* being then extruded to keep up the symmetry. If this be the true explanation, it goes to show that not only the Latin versions but also the Syriac, the Theban and the Gothic have been derived from a source thus tampered with. In Acts xvii. 19 it is possible that *πυθάνομενοι καὶ λέγοντες* may have come from *rogitantes et dicentes*, but there seems no reason to postulate a free rendering of the original *λέγοντες*, which surely needed no expansion, rather than an interpolation in the Greek. In any case we may notice (1) that the blunder *cogitantes* in D throws the supposed assimilation back a stage or two in the history of the text; (2) that an insertion just before of the words *μετα δε ημερας τινας* without any apparent motive shows that an interpolating hand has been at work on the passage. In Acts xxi. 39 Δ departs from all other MSS. by giving *συνχωρησαι* for *ἐπίτρεψον*; if this be a capricious variant, it may serve as a precedent for a good many more; there seems no reason to assume that it has come through *permitte*. The Latin

text seems too confused (*cuius rogo obsegro autem mihi*) to respond to Mr. Harris's treatment.

Luke xxii. 12 furnishes some curious phenomena, but I cannot altogether agree with Mr. Harris in the way in which he handles them. The text runs *κακεῖνος ὑμῶν δείξει ἀνάγαιον μέγα ἐστρωμένον*: D has *ille vobis ostendet superiorem domum stratum*; Δ *εκείνος υμειν δειξει αναγαιον οικον εστρωμενον*. That *superiorem domum* is an attempt to translate *ἀνάγαιον* is probable enough; and *οικον* may well have come in from *domum*. But Mr. Harris goes on to argue that "the Latin translator rendered *ἀνάγαιον* by *manianum*, a word understood in the vulgar Latin of the provinces and especially, it would seem, in Africa: this occurs in *a* as *medianum* both here and in Mark xiv. 15. There it is corrupted in *b* into *pede plano*, and as this was unintelligible by itself, in other copies *locum* was added. In *d* (our D) *medianum* is boldly corrected into *superiorem domum*." Now notice first that *manianum* is not at all a vulgar, still less an African word; it is used by Cicero, and denoted primarily certain structures in the Roman Forum. Secondly, *medianum* may be a corruption of *manianum*, as has been suggested also at a place in the Digest (ix. 3, 5, 7), where it likewise occurs; but the fact that it is found at least in three places points to its being a genuine form. Thirdly, the question whether there was a Latin translator, or more than one, is the very point at issue; if any one were asked whether *superiorem domum* came from *ἀνάγαιον* directly, or through a *manianum* which has entirely disappeared, the answer could hardly be doubtful. In Mark xiv. 15 *αναγαιον οικον* has nothing answering to it in the Latin, whatever may be the explanation of the gap. On Acts xvi. 29 *φῶτα δὲ αἰτήσας εἰσεπέδησεν*, Mr. Harris ingeniously suggests that the *petens* of the Latin may in some copies have given rise to *αἰτῶν*, which then in the form of *ἄπτων* produced the Syriac rendering "having kindled a light." His instances

of the substitution of an infinitive for *ὅτι* with the indicative, or of *ἵνα* with the subjunctive for an infinitive hardly go beyond the common variations of Greek MSS., though of course they admit of being explained by Latin influence. But in such cases, as in many others of the kind, it is not easy to see what would be the inducement to the supposed reviser. In Mark v. 17 *καὶ παρεκαλουν αυτον ινα απελθη* (Δ), it is assumed that *ινα απελθη* would have been as in other MSS. *απελθειν*, if it had not been for the Latin *ut discederet*. But what should induce a copyist to introduce this verbal correspondence? We may notice that in the same verse Δ substitutes *παρεκαλουν* for the genuine *ἤρξαντο παρακαλεῖν*; in v. 18 where conversely it has *ηρξατο παρακαλειν* where all other authorities have *παρεκαλει*, this is ascribed to the Latin rendering. Are we to suppose that in v. 18 Δ has alone escaped the Latinizing to which in v. 17 it alone fell a victim? Such a case is an unmistakable warning against overlooking the probability of capricious paraphrasing. In John xii. 25 *απολλύει* is the reading of \aleph BL 33 and is probably right, although in *four* parallel passages (Matt. x. 39, Mark viii. 35, Luke ix. 24, xvii. 33), *απολέσει* is read without variation, and *φυλάξει* immediately follows. All other MSS. and all versions have fallen into the almost inevitable assimilation and read *απολέσει*. Mr. Harris argues that they did so because they were misled by the Latin *perdet*, which they took for a future, though it was really a heteroclitite present. Do we need this assumption in view of the facts of the case, and is it a natural one to make? There is a very similar case in Matthew xvii. 15 where *καὶ κακῶς ἔχει* depends solely upon \aleph BL (with Z doubtful); every other authority gives *καὶ κακῶς πάσχει*, and Mr. Harris assumes that they have all been corrupted by the Latin *et male patitur*. In Mark iv. 21 *μήτι ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος*, if Δ , agreeing with some old Latin texts and some versions, gives *απτεται*, is it not more probable that this is

a correction to suit the sense [Mr. Harris says that it ought to be right] than that it is due to some confusion between *accendo* and *accedo*, which is not the most natural word for ἔρχεται. On the other hand the suggestion that in Matthew xv. 11 *κοινωνει* has come in (for *κοινοῖ*) through *communicat*, and similarly in Acts xxi. 28, is very plausible; for *communicare*, as in Tertullian's citation of this verse, does bear the meaning of "pollute," which of course *κοινωνεῖν* could not. In Mark viii. 3 a reading ἤκασιν is said to be due to the Latin which is found in \aleph A and every MS. and version but B L Δ (Bas.) and Memph., and in viii. 13 there is almost the same authority for εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, which again is ascribed to Latinizing. I cannot see either in the nature of things or in the facts of textual criticism the slightest reason for supposing that it was more likely that *in navem* should have been added to *ascendit*, before εἰς τὸ πλοῖον was added to ἐμβάς. In Mark vi. 39 Mr. Harris speaks of the "idiomatic" *συμπόσια συμπόσια*. Would it have seemed idiomatic to the transcriber of Δ or its parent MS., or to those for whom he wrote it; and would he have had to wait for the Latin *secundum contubernia* before he could give the natural equivalent *κατα την συνποσιαν*? In John vi. 23 there has doubtless been a misunderstanding of the original text, but not necessarily by the translator first; Tregelles takes the view (probably wrongly), which Mr. Harris ascribes to a blunder of the Latin translator, that *αλλα* is paroxytone, not oxytone. In Matthew v. 24 *προσφερεις* for *προσφερε* seems hard to explain except as from *offeres*, a form by the way which the Clementine Vulgate has retained: yet we may suspect that *offeres* is itself corrupted from *offers*, the rendering of Am. In v. 40 we have *αφησεις*, and *dimittes* for ἄφες; in v. 42 *dat* for δός is more puzzling. Perhaps it may be a sign that the final *t* was already nearly or quite dropped. In v. 40 *ὁ θελων* . . . *αφησεις αυτω* (for τῷ θέλοντι) certainly looks much like a

rendering of *qui voluerit* by some one who had not looked on to the end of the sentence; but even here it is perhaps easier to suppose the alteration made by the hastiness of a careless transcriber than by any deliberate adaptation. In Matthew xiii. 48 the earlier reading ἦν ὅτε ἐπληρώθη ἀναβιβάσαντες appears in Δ as οτε δε επληρωθη ανεβιβασαν αυτην: the deviation is noteworthy, but at least it is not a very close reproduction of the Latin *cum autem impleta fuerit educent eam*; if there was intentional assimilation, it is hard to see why it should have stopped where it did. In Matthew xv. 9 for πόρρω ἀπέχει Δ has πορρω εστιν, D *longe est*; unless we assume that Δ never capriciously deviates, there is nothing to determine which was the first to make the variation here. Of many more of Mr. Harris's instances in this section, I do not think it safe to say more than that Δ and D agree in a looseness of expression, which may have originated with either. Why, for instance, is it less likely that εἰρήνην ποιῆσαι came straight from εἰρήνην δοῦναι than *pacem facere*; or why in Acts xii. 15 is τυχὸν less likely to have been inserted than *forsitan*? So in Acts iii. 22 προφήτην . . . ἀναστήσει . . . ὡς ἐμέ αὐτοῦ ἀκούσασθε, if we find this corrupted into ὡς ἐμου αὐτου ακουσεσθε, it will not occur to us that we must trace the corruption to a Latin translator first, in order to account for it. In Luke viii. 30 the right text is ὅτι εἰσῆλθεν δαιμόνια πολλὰ εἰς αὐτόν (where for a wonder Mr. Harris does not quote quite correctly), Δ has πολλα γαρ ησαν δαιμονια. Mr. Harris suggests that the Latin was *multa enim inierant demonia*, and the *enim inierant* easily became *enim erant*. This is so neat as to be irresistible; but it should be observed that the error is confined to Δ, and that it is no evidence of the wide extent of Latinizing which is postulated. Hence when in Matthew xxviii. 19 B and Δ agree in βαπτίσαντες, even if we do not attempt to defend this, we shall be slow to explain it by the influence of *baptizantes*, seeing that if any

MS. in existence has escaped Latinizing, that MS. is B. If one of the commonest of transcribers' errors needs to be specially accounted for, there is an aorist participle as well as an aorist imperative in close proximity, to which βαπτίζοντες might be conformed. In Mark viii. 36 κερδήσαι is found only in \aleph B, ἐὰν κερδήσῃ in every other authority; what probability is there that all must owe their corruption to *si lucratur*? The case is quite different with errors which are limited to Δ and its Latin affinities. If for instance in Mark x. 16 for καὶ ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὰ Δ (and Δ alone of Greek MSS.) gives και προσκαλεσαμενος αυτα, it is highly probable that this is due to *convocans eos*, originating in a misreading of the Greek, though of course it is not impossible that ENANKAL should have been miswritten ENKAL, and then deliberately changed to προσκαλ. In Luke v. 8, if we are to take ποσίν as a Latinism for γόνασι, it is as likely perhaps to be due to the transcriber's greater familiarity with the Latin idiom, as to assimilation to the Latin version, which by the way in all other cases retains *genua*. In Acts iii. 24 for ὅσοι ἐλάλησαν Δ has ο ελαλησεν: this is neatly explained by assuming that ὅσοι was rendered *quodquod* (for *quotquot* as often), and this gave rise to ὅ, which naturally suggested the singular verb, another proof by the way that the reviser has not handled the present text of Δ, for D retains *locuti sunt*. In Acts xix. 29 it is pretty clear that the original reading was ἐπλήσθη ἡ πόλις τῆς συγχύσεως, reproduced pretty faithfully in the Latin *repleta est tota civitas confusionis*. The reading of Δ συνεχύθη ολη η πολισ αισχυνης is apparently a capricious variation: *αισχύνης* may have come in as an equivalent of *συγχύσεως*, and perhaps the most plausible suggestion would be that *συνεχύθη* was a gloss written over ἐπλήσθη, intended to explain the phrase ἐπλήσθη συγχύσεως, that this came into the text, giving *συνεχύθη συγχύσεως*, and that the latter was replaced by *αισχύνης*, to avoid the clumsiness of the

phrase. In any case the theory of Latinizing does not help us here; and it is not clear what Mr. Harris means by "the early attestation of both the suggested primitive forms." There is absolutely no support for *συνεχύθη* except in Δ, not even in D. Nor do I find any good reason for his statement that "evidently *αἰσχύνης* has been put in to balance *confusionem*"; if we start with the reading of all other authorities but Δ, no difficulty arises.

It has been impossible to examine here more than a small proportion of the instances which Mr. Harris adduces, though all have been carefully verified for the preparation of this paper; and those have naturally been selected which seemed either the most convincing on the one hand, or the most open to criticism on the other. The general impression left on my own mind, and I hope that even this selection of facts may have served to give grounds for it, is that Mr. Harris has made out his case, so far as to prove the existence of this Latinizing influence in the case of Δ, or, to be more exact, in the case of a text from which Δ has descended, but that many of his cases are doubtful, some highly improbable, and that among the improbable ones must be accounted all those which implicate A C (and *a fortiori* B) in the same charge of Latinizing. Further, the agreement of the great majority of the Latin texts in some of the most significant errors seems to show that we may look for some common source; and thus the problem becomes that of reconstructing a primitive Latin rendering, which will be the representative of a very early Greek MS.

Although this is not the place to discuss Mr. Harris's remarks on the phonetic peculiarities of the Greek of Δ, I cannot forbear saying that while they show much careful observation they must be received with some caution. Nothing for instance can be more improbable than his suggestion that the many Ionisms and few Dorisms, which

he thinks he can detect, afford any evidence that the MS. was written in Gaul, and to draw an argument from the assumed connexion of *Rhodanus* and *Rhodus* is really absurd.

It is more to the point to consider what is the general character of the text of Δ , and how it acquired this. Mr. Harris thinks that he can show that the interpolations in Luke and the Acts, which are said to amount to 600 in the latter book alone, are due, at least in some cases, to Montanist influences. His first argument is a weak one. When in the *Acta Perpetuæ* the martyrs are brought by four angels to the gates of Paradise, they are received and welcomed by four other angels, who cry, "ecce sunt, ecce sunt!" This might seem a fairly obvious form of welcome. But in Δ of Luke xiii. 29, 30, we find

*και ηξουσιν απο ανατολων και δυσμων
και βορρα και νοτου και ανακλιθησονται
εν τη βασιλεια του θυ και ειδου εισιν
εσχατοι οι εσονται πρωτοι κτλ.*

It is held that this arrangement of lines shows that the cry of the angels was "an early commentary on a badly divided text," and that this text was in the hands of the church at Carthage. This seems a good deal of stress to lay upon the occurrence of such common words.

Next it is pointed out that Δ has in Acts ii. 17, *οι υιοι αυτων* for *οι υιοι υμων*: this reading is also found in the *Acta Perpetuæ*. "Is it unreasonable to suggest," says Mr. Harris, "that the change has been made by some one who was interested to prove that the gift of prophecy had passed over from the Jewish Church to the Christian?" But is it less reasonable to suggest that the change is merely a grammatical adaptation to the preceding words? If in a missing word competition there were given *εκχεω* *απο του πνευματος μου επι πασαν σαρκα και προφητευσουσιν*

οἱ υἱοὶ—, I fancy that more would supply *αὐτῶν* than *ὑμῶν*. The former is found in Tertullian, as well as in Hilarius, and this shows that it was widely current in the West.

Perhaps a more fruitful source of enquiry is furnished by the nature of the glosses in the Acts. The Montanists laid great stress on the work of the Holy Spirit, and some eight of these glosses do intrude a reference to this. On the other hand, in view of the great number of the glosses to which no such character can be assigned, too much stress must not be laid on this. And it is here of great importance to observe carefully the attestation of these glosses by other authorities. Mr. Harris's contention is that the Western text of Luke and Acts is a Montanist text, earlier in date than the time of Perpetua. Now the interpolations in xv. 20, 29, are found in Δ and in the Theban and Ethiopic versions, in v. 39 there is no trace of the interpolation in any version, nor is there of that in xvi. 4 (except in Syr. Harkl. marg.), nor of that in vi. 10. These evidently stand on a very different footing as evidence of the diffusion of the reading. The strongest cases for Mr. Harris's theory are Acts xv. 20, 29, with the repeated addition of the words "and all things that ye would not should be done unto you, do them not unto others"; and those in which *μετὰ πάσης παρησίας* is added. But they can hardly be said to be distinctively Montanist. The question as to the nature and range of this influence deserves fuller examination, but it can hardly be said to be decided as yet.

But further, Mr. Harris claims that as he has shown Latinization of the Greek text at work, the Greek text can have no certain value, except where it differs from its own Latin, and must no longer be regarded as an independent authority. Here I fail to follow his argument. Admitted that there are unmistakable traces that at some stage in the history of the tradition, the Greek text was here and

there adapted to the Latin, there is no evidence whatever to show that this was done either systematically or completely. It has always been recognised by all the world (but Bornemann) that Δ contained many serious depravations of the text; no one has accepted its testimony unless strongly supported; if we can discover the origin of the depravations, that does not give them more claim to our consideration, and they could hardly have less. Indeed the agreement of Δ and D may be taken just as well as evidence of their original source as of harmonizing; and other considerations must be brought in to decide in each individual case.

Another line of evidence is drawn from the Latin translation of Irenæus. This confessedly agrees in some remarkable readings with D. Dr. Hort held this to be due to the fact that the translation of Irenæus was made in the fourth century, and that the Latin version which appears in D was familiar to him, so that he naturally adopted its language in translating the quotations which Irenæus had made in Greek. Mr. Harris's contention is (1) that some of the interpolations now found in quotations by Irenæus, though only preserved in the Latin version, belong to the Greek original; (2) but that they are due to the influence of a Latin version; (3) that therefore this version must have been made long enough before the time of Irenæus for its influence to affect the Greek text which that father used. There are three passages where *μετὰ παρρησίας* or *μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας* seems to have been inserted; one of these (Acts ix. 10) happens to be quoted by Irenæus with the suspected words. Now if this phrase were exclusively used in interpolated passages, this would be a very strong argument. But there are at least four other places where it is undoubtedly genuine; and it is not at all improbable that Irenæus used the words here carelessly by a slip of memory. It is unfortunately not certain, owing to a defect in the MS.,

that they appeared here at all in Δ . But if they did, were they due to Latin influence? *i.e.* were they inserted first in the Latin version, and from this transferred to the Greek text which Irenæus used? The only reason for thinking so is that they seem to belong to a group which has a Montanist colouring. But nothing prevents a verse from being interpolated twice over at different stages. Another case quoted by Mr. Harris seems rather to tell against him. To Acts xv. 29 Δ adds *φερομενοι εν τω αγιω πνευματι*, *D ferentes in santo spō*. Irenæus has *ambulantes in spiritu sancto*. Does this look like an independent translation from the Greek or a borrowing from the Latin? Of course, it may be contended that any interpolated reference to the Holy Spirit must be Montanist in origin, and that a Montanist interpolation must have been made in Latin; but to do so is begging the question. Similarly in Acts iii. 17, Δ has *κατα αγνοιαν επραξατε πονηρον*, *D per ignorantiam egistis iniquitatem*, Irenæus *secundum ignorantiam egistis nequam*; it is easy to say that the primitive form in *D* was doubtless *nequam*. If so, why and how should it have been changed? The argument here is hard to follow. If the Latin translator of Irenæus was guided in translating the quotations by his knowledge of the version which we have in *D*, why does he often depart from it? If he was only translating from a Greek text, which had been assimilated to such a version, why should we assume that he would always hit upon the precise word which had originally been used? *e.g.* if *πονηρον* came from *D*, where we now find *iniquitatem*, and is rendered by *nequam*, why assume that *nequam* originally stood in *D*? The evidence that Tertullian used the Latin translation of Irenæus is very slight; and is not much strengthened by the contention that there is a "fair possibility" that Cyprian used it. So far Mr. Harris's statement that "the Greek of the Beza text owes the *greater part* of its textual and grammatical

peculiarities to the reflex action of its own Latin" (p. 171) seems to have been inadequately supported.

He next takes up the question of the relation of the Harmony of Tatian to Δ , and adduces seven instances in which Tatian agrees with the Latinized text. If these stand examination, the conclusion is a most important one, as to the date and the distribution of this type of readings. It will follow that the Latin version must have been made long enough before the time of Tatian for it to have affected the Greek text, and that this text must have been sufficiently widely distributed to make it natural that Tatian should use it as his basis. Now mere coincidence in a reading is not enough to establish connexion, unless there is something striking about the reading. *E.g.* in John xiv. 9 *ποσοῦτον χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμί, καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωκάς με, Φίλιππε;* the wonder is not that several Latin authorities have *cognovistis*, but that any have escaped the attraction of the plural. In John xiii. 14 the [*πόσῳ μίλλον*] *καὶ ὑμεῖς ὀφείλετε ἀλλήλων νίπτειν τοὺς πόδας* is not more likely to have come in from a translator than to be introduced by a transcriber. In Mark i. 33 (for which, by the way, there is almost the sole misprint in Mr. Harris's numerous references) the multitude was gathered together *πρὸς τὴν θύραν αὐτοῦ*, the last word was such a natural addition that Tatian's *ad ianuam Jesu* does not of necessity imply connexion. Nor does the reading in Luke v. 8. If a Latin translator could render *ἔξελθε* by *rogo exi*, as Mr. Harris assumes him to have done, one does not see why a Syriac renderer should not have given the equivalent of *peto a te ut a me recedas*, especially as we have only a Latin version of an Arabic translation of the original rendering. In John xvi. 21, for *ἡ ὥρα αὐτῆς* Δ has *ἡ ἡμερα αὐτης*, a very natural variation; it is worth noticing, however, that none of the versions show it, except the Peshitto; Tatian renders *adventus diei partus eius*. May not this have been a quite independent expla-

natory paraphrase by the translator? In Mark ix. 15 *προστρέχοντες* has got corrupted in Δ into *προσχεροντες* (for *προσχαιροντες*), a reading followed by several of the old Latin versions. It is quite clear that this corruption did not begin in Latin, but in some Greek ancestor of Δ . If therefore Tatian's version is represented by *prae gaudio properantes*, this does not suggest the use of any Latinized text, but merely of one into which this error had crept. Mr. Harris says that "no other Greek traces of the reading are forthcoming than those in Δ "; but as D has *gaudentes*, it is clear on his own theory that it did not arise in Δ , and it is highly probable that other copies besides Δ were taken from the text in which it did originate. In Luke xxi. 25, *καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς συνοχή ἐθνῶν*, D has *et super terram conflictio gentium*; other versions have different renderings, *compressio*, *occursus*, *pressura* (Vulg.); the Syriac (Cur. and Pesh.), have the equivalent of *complosio manuum gentium*. The version of Tatian has the conflate rendering *pressura gentium et frictio manuum*, which cannot be original. Mr. Harris is probably right in saying that *frictio manuum gentium* is the correct reading as supported by the Syriac. But is it so certain that *frictio manuum* must have come not from *συνοχή*, but from *conflictio*? In Luke xxiv. 29, *ὅτι πρὸς ἐσπέραν ἐστὶ καὶ κέκλικεν ἡ ἡμέρα*, Δ omits *ἐστὶ καὶ* before *κέκλικεν*, written *καικλεικεν*. This is clearly a mistake which must have arisen in a Greek MS.; it is shared by the old Latin texts and the Peshitto, a strong proof that they used a text agreeing here with Δ . But to say that this error could only have originated in a bilingual, because no trace of it is found in any Greek MS. but Δ , seems to go far beyond what the evidence requires. There seems no reason why it should not have arisen in an ancestor of Δ , as yet unaffected by a Latin version. Mr. Harris justly says that one instance will prove his case, but then that must be a demonstrative and irrefragable instance; and at most we

have possibilities which can be converted into probabilities only by evidence from other sources.

A further argument Mr. Harris draws from the nature of the glosses, trying to show that even when not Montanistic in character, they are obviously of Latin origin. For instance, in Acts iii. (misprinted ii.) 13 there is added in Δ *εις κρισιν*, in *E* *εις κριτηριον*; but in *D* *in iudicio*, in *e* and in Irenæus as *in iudicium*, the variation in the Greek seeming to indicate an altered rendering of the same Latin gloss. But let us try to realize the process through which the scribe of *E* passed, according to this theory. Cod. *E* is "probably a direct descendant of Cod. Bezaë" (Harris); he thereupon had before him in Δ *εις κρισιν*, in *D* *in iudicio*; this gloss had come in at an earlier stage in the Greek, from a still earlier insertion in the Latin. All trace of its being a gloss had therefore long been obliterated. Yet the scribe of *E* scents out its nature instinctively, and therefore feels at liberty to attempt another rendering of the original Latin! In precisely the same way he is supposed to have discovered that in Acts v. 38, although he has before him in Δ *μη μιαναντες τας χειρας*, and in *D* *non coinquinatas manus*, these are but parts of a Montanist gloss, that the Latin was the earlier, and that therefore he is at liberty to attempt another rendering of it, by changing *μιαναντες* into *μολυναντες*, besides correcting the obvious error *coinquinatas* into *coinquinantes*.

On Acts xii. 10 Mr. Harris has an ingenious theory—they are all astonishingly and delightfully ingenious—to account for a puzzling gloss. Δ has (of Peter and the angel) *και εξελθοντες κατεβησαν τους ζ βαθμους και προσηλθαν ρυμαν μιαν*, *D* *et cum exissent descenderunt septem grados et processerunt gradum unum*: the true text is *και ἐξελθόντες προῆλθον ῥύμην μίαν*. Where do these "seven steps" come from? Mr. Harris promptly tells us, from a Latin version of Homer, the glossete remembering how Poseidon came down from

the mountains of Thrace in three strides, reaching his goal with the fourth, and then turning three into seven for metrical reasons. The ἄγγελος κυρίου is supposed to have suggested Hermes, and Hermes to have recalled (heaven knows why!) the descent of Poseidon. A confirmation of this theory is sought in the fact that the glossete, thinking of the rod of Hermes, makes the angel thrust at Peter with a wand (νύξας), and not strike him with his hand (πατάξας), as in earlier authorities. Mr. Harris forgets II. xvi. 704, χείρεσσ' ἄθανάτησι φαεινὴν ἀσπίδα νύσσων, which shows that immortals were able to thrust with their hands. But where is the evidence for the Latinizing? Apparently only in the fact that there has been some slight probability that elsewhere a Latin Homeric cento has been employed. Here the Homerizing is much less evident. And if the Greek comes from the Latin, why τοὺς ζ βαθμοὺς, and whence the genuine ρυμην? Another point drawn from the κατέβη is as ingenious, but not less dubious. The gloss-writer "must have been in some city where people went up when they were committed to prison, and came down when they recovered their freedom." This was the case at Carthage, where the prison was on the Byrsa, hundreds of feet above the town. Hence perhaps the glossete was a Carthaginian. Yes, but it was also the case in almost every town which had an acropolis. It was the case at Jerusalem, whatever view we may take as to the exact spot of Peter's imprisonment. It was so at Rome, where a prisoner would certainly come *down* to the Forum. No weight can, I think, be attached to this.

The hypothesis of an African origin for these glosses is buttressed by cases of assumed African idiom, but these are not convincing. The instances quoted as accusatives absolute may be explained for the most part as mere negligences. In Acts xv. 11 *sileuitque* for ἐσιγησεν is indicative of some omitted verb, which would have governed *desponentes pres-*

byteros : in xx. 12 *salutantes—adduxerunt*, where the Greek has a singular verb, certainly looks as if a nominative was intended ; in xiv. 19 the accusatives may well be governed by *supervenerunt*. Acts iii. 17 is perhaps doubtful, but the Latin seems to me the most natural and exact rendering of the Greek ; and so with Acts xvi. 37. The only plausible accusative absolute is in Acts v. 38, where *coinquinatas manus* may fairly be taken as a mere slip for *coinquantes manus* ; and unless the Latin is older than the Greek, the point to be proved, it certainly is. In Matthew xvii. 19 we have, according to Mr. Harris, *descendentes* equivalent to *καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν*, but we look in vain in Africa or anywhere else for a parallel to such an accusative absolute of one term only. In Mark xi. 12 we find *ἐξελθόντα* (for *ἐξελθόντων αὐτῶν*), where the Latin is *cum exissent*. I do not know whether Mr. Harris would say that this answers to *exeuntem*, which had been intruded into the Latin, had displaced the original Greek, and had afterwards been corrected itself, still leaving the corruption in the Greek. I think it simpler to regard it as an assimilation by a nodding copyist to the preceding *ἐπαύριον*. But it is curious to notice how wide the traces of the blunder are.

The evidence for the *tumor Africanus* is not convincing. In Acts vii. 5 *possessionem hereditatis* is not an unnatural rendering of *κληρονομίαν*. In Acts vii. 46 the absurd reading of \aleph B H, as well as Δ *ἠτήσαντο εὐρεῖν σκῆνωμα τῷ οἴκῳ* (for τῷ Θεῷ) is explained by the fact that *οἶκον* occurs in the next line, and that the combination *οἶκος Ἰακώβ* (or rather *Ἰσραήλ*) was so common as to suggest itself at once. It is then a very simple case of parablepsy. Mr. Harris suggests that *σκῆνωμα* may have been translated by *tabernaculum* and also by *sedes domui* (a very unlikely rendering), and that the latter may have given rise not only in Δ , but also in \aleph B, to *οἴκῳ*. Other examples are more plausible, but none seem to go beyond the natural limits of a slightly periphrastic ren-

dering. In Mark vi. 43 does Mr. Harris think that the original reading was κλάσματα, that this was translated *reliquias fragmentorum*, that *reliquias* was then omitted, and κλάσματα changed into κλασμάτων to suit *fragmentorum*? So it would seem; but I suppose he would accept the πληρώματα of B and Δ, etc., as genuine; and this gives strong support to κλασμάτων (Ti., Tr.) as sound, though undoubtedly the text is hard to settle. In Luke xiii. 8 βάλω κόπρια appears in Δ as βαλω κοφινον κοπριων, while D has *mittam qualum stercoris*. Why should D here alone translate κοφινον by *qualum*? Mr. Harris very cleverly suggests that κόπρια was rendered by *squalem stercoris*, and that this early became corrupted into *qualum stercoris*, whence κοφινον κοπριων in Δ. But let us again try to realise the process. An early Greek text has κόπρια; this is rendered into Latin by a "tumid African" by *squalem stercoris*; and his version is set side by side with a Greek text, which is subsequently assimilated to it. We find no trace in the Greek of the original paraphrase, but at some later time, when *squalem* has become accidentally corrupted into *qualum*, then it causes the Greek to follow suit, and changes κόπρια into κοφινον κοπριων. Does this sound probable? That *qualum* was a natural translation of κόφινον is proved by Prudentius (Cath. ix. 60), who uses *qualus* in a reference to the feeding of the five thousand. There can be no objection to supposing that the paraphrase in the Greek is the earlier, except the assumption, by no means proved, that all such are of Latin origin. Mr. Harris does not fail to see that his theory of the origin of these glosses at Carthage requires us to assign them to a very early date in order to account for the wide diffusion of the text so expanded, which can only be accounted for if it was accepted at Rome. But he does not deal with the question why a text originating in Carthage should have been so accepted. There must have been by the middle of the second century a Latin version of the

Gospels current at Rome. How should this have been displaced by one of external origin? It is not sufficient to say that the Montanist glosses gave it currency, when Montanism was in the ascendant there. They are certainly not characteristic or obtrusive enough to warrant such a notion.

There is no part of his work in which Mr. Harris's method is more admirable than where he handles the glosses in the Western text of the Acts. He puts together 190 of the more important—there are more than 600 in all—and examines their character, with a view to provisional classification. He finds that C attests only four of them (the reference to Acts xv. 4 is an error, for the gloss occurs only in C³), and these show no marked Latinism. Hence he rightly concludes that these Western elements in C are antecedent to the Latin rendering, a point to be carefully borne in mind. Also of the glosses which seem to have a decided Montanist colouring, none appear in C or in the Syriac Peshitto. The argument which is drawn from Acts xii. 7, as to the date of the primitive Syriac, seems very precarious. But the Theban version is unquestionably after the Montanist glosses.

In dealing with the Gospels Mr. Harris finds no definite traces of Montanism, except the striking reading in Luke xi. 2, *αγιασθητω ονομα σου εφ ημας*, where the last two words may perhaps preserve a trace of the curious variant *ἐλθέτω τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐφ' ἡμᾶς*. But he thinks that there are definite traces of Marcionite influence. The reading *ουδεις εγνω τον πατερα* (for *ἐπιγινώσκει*), common in early Fathers, may be due to a retranslation of *novit*. That *pater* is added in D at Luke xviii. 19, *nemo bonus nisi unus d̄s pater*, may be due to Marcionite tendencies; but it is to be noted that Origen uses the word without hesitation. Mr. Harris rather startles us by assuming that in Matthew xix. 16 *τί με ἐρωτᾶς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ*, is a Gnostic depravation, derived from a Western bilinguist. If it was a deliberate corruption, how did the parallel passages in Mark and Luke escape?

And where are we to look for an uncorrupted tradition if \aleph B L fail us? Again, in Luke xxiii. 2 a Marcionite gloss, *καὶ καταλύοντα τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφῆτας* was added, according to Epiphanius: it is found in several MSS. of the Old Latin versions, including one or two of the Vulgate; but there is not a trace of it in any Greek text. If, as Mr. Harris supposes, it stood in the ancient Roman bilinguals, why has it disappeared so completely even from MSS. so much influenced by these? Similarly, with the further addition, *καὶ ἀποστρέφοντα τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ τὰ τέκνα*, to which in *c* and *e* there is added *non enim baptizantur sicut et nos nec se mundant*. There is no doubt as to the Marcionite character of the gloss, the Gnostics wishing to represent the same charges as being brought against Christ which were directed against themselves. But again, why suppose that they ever stood in a Greek text which gives no trace of them? Surely it is possible to believe that one or two codices are interpolated without holding that this corruption ever extended to the Western text generally. To say that the primitive Western bilingual was Marcionized is to go beyond the evidence, except on the hypothesis that no Marcionite interpolations could creep into any of its descendants at a later date. The omission of *æternum* in *g*². at Luke x. 25 is proof that the excisions of Marcion did leave traces in Latin versions, not that the general tradition was corrupted thereby.

Mr. Harris recognises the tentative character of much of his reconstruction of the history of the Western text, and offers suggestions as to the way in which the problem must be worked out. His remarks on the *κῶλα* of Δ and D support, though they go but little way to demonstrate, the antiquity of the Latin version. Some curious cases of confusion between the abbreviations *dī* and *dñi* lead him to express himself definitely in favour of *ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ* in Acts xx. 28, though against A and C, as well as D and E.

Finally, Mr. Harris closes his discussion with calling attention to a few isolated phenomena which seem to confirm his theory, and to special questions which still need investigation.

At the first reading it is almost impossible to resist the impression left by the learning, the ingenuity, the familiar acquaintance with the critical material, and the fresh insight into early Christian literature, which mark this noteworthy treatise. But the repeated study which it claims and repays leaves an uneasy feeling of an imposing edifice resting on weak and scanty foundations. The evidence, it is true, is cumulative, and great injustice has been done to the force of it by selecting, as has been imperative in this paper, only portions of it for examination. But many threads do not make a strong stay, if each has to stand separately a strain too great for its resisting powers. It is deeply to be regretted that the great master of textual criticism, whom we have lost in Dr. Hort, was not able, so far as I have learnt, to give his judgment on a theory which cut straight across some of his favourite notions, but which his candour would have led him to be the first to accept, if he had regarded it as established. Perhaps there is no one left whose verdict will weigh so heavily. The present paper is in no sense intended as a verdict. It is rather a plea in arrest of judgment until some of the difficulties have been removed which hang about an attractive theory, supported with conspicuous ability, but not yet, I venture to think, raised above the level of a possible hypothesis.

A. S. WILKINS.

THE REALIST AMONG THE DISCIPLES.

FOR two reasons the Apostle Thomas has not had justice done him. One is that a man such as he was does not do justice to himself in what he says and does, and so is often misjudged. The other is that a not entirely appropriate description has been attached to Thomas in the popular mind. He is always called "doubting Thomas." The epithet is as true as and no truer than Bacon's famous "jesting Pilate." Pilate jested and Thomas doubted, but neither the jest in the one case nor the doubt in the other is the key to the man.

Thomas was not a doubter so much as a realist. His characteristic was not a denial of the spiritual, but a great difficulty in reaching it. He never came to a conclusion adverse to Christ or to spiritual things, and to call him, as is sometimes done, "the sceptic among the apostles" is absurd. But he could not accept such things so easily as some others could. His mind was one that was much impressed by what was round about him, by what was existent and apparent, and he did not lightly get past that to the unseen. Facts were always present to him, and if he was to have faith it must face them and not fly over them. But all this is not scepticism: it is only sober realism.

If a great ideal is put before them, two different types of mind receive it in two very different ways. One rushes to it with enthusiasm, and is inspired by it to the forgetting or the scorning of the thought of difficulties or defeat. The other is never blinded to the practical situation. It knows an idea, even an ideal, is a very different thing from a *fait accompli*, and that a new hope is always the risk of a new despair. Whenever a great and inspiring enterprise is started in, for example, social reform—a recent illustration

of it was when General Booth launched his "Darkest England" proposals—one may see these two tendencies among those who receive it. Thomas's mind was of the latter of these two types. He believed in Christ, but he felt it was no light thing to believe in Him. The Kingdom of God, of which He was constantly speaking, would not be built in a day. It was a little premature to begin already to dispute, as some of his more ardent fellow-disciples were doing, who would sit on the thrones next the Master. They were hardly that length yet. Even when Christ Himself was speaking among the sunny, flower-clad hills of Galilee, Thomas's mind would sometimes wander—not unbelievably, but seriously—to the difficulties of the long path that lay in front, and that had to be traversed before it all would be realized.

Does this mean that Thomas had really no right to be an apostle? Such allegiance may seem to be unworthy to be associated with the impetuous enthusiasm of Peter or the ardent devotion of John. On the contrary, the discipleship of Thomas was a notably worthy discipleship. For let us remember that the whole tendency of a nature such as his would be to remain outside a movement such as Christ's, to watch it—perhaps sympathetically—but no more. His bias would be very strongly against committing himself. But Thomas did commit himself. He identified himself with the Galilean Prophet's immediate following. He did this in no blind excitement and under no passing impulse, but with a full and grave sense of what would be involved in it. This was, I say, a notable discipleship, and the worth of it would be appreciated by no one more than the Master Himself. Thomas accepted Christ as his Leader, and where his Leader went he followed, though he saw the goal was both dangerous and distant. That he should be found in Christ's immediate following at all, committed to Him, speaks volumes for a man like Thomas.

It is not always so with Thomases or would-be Thomases to-day.

But what sort of a disciple did this sober-minded realist make? Would his not be a chilling, weakening influence? Let us see. Unfortunately we have only three glimpses of him; but they are all important and significant. They are recorded, it may be mentioned, only in the Fourth Gospel. The author of that Gospel, whether the Apostle John or not, was unquestionably a man of supreme spiritual elevation and insight. His temperament was that of the seer—a temperament the very opposite of that of the realist. But such souls have often a very special affection for those of wingless faith. Is it altogether fanciful to wonder whether some such regard inspired the record of Thomas's deeds and words in this Gospel?

The first appearance of Thomas in the evangelical narrative is on the occasion when Jesus proposed to go to Bethany, where Lazarus lay dead, and to Jerusalem, despite the danger that threatened there. When the disciples heard the proposal they remonstrated. "The Jews," they said to the Master, "of late sought to stone Thee, and goest Thou thither again?" But when he persisted in his intention, who was it at last who spoke? It was an unusual spokesman—Thomas. He was not blind to the danger of going towards the capital. He knew it meant difficulty and peril; more than that, he considered it meant death. With the knowledge of all this, with his eyes open, and with the apprehension of the worst, Thomas turned to his brethren and said, "Let us also go, that we may die with Him." One is not quite justified, since the Gospels are such very meagre reports, in judging from the silence of the rest and the unwonted leadership of Thomas that the others were afraid. It looks not altogether unlike it. At any rate Thomas was in this most critical hour conspicuously faithful and brave.

We can in part understand it. To the others, just because of their enthusiastic following of Christ, the thought of his defeat and death must have been utterly paralyzing. It was the rocking of the very world under their feet. To Thomas it was somewhat different. A man of his temperament was able to admit into his mind, alongside of even a very real and deep devotion to Christ, contemplations and calculations that would not occur to others. His mind had at times gone forward to consider what the relations of Christ and the authorities might come to be. He, like his Master, was not deceived by the excitement of Galilean crowds. Beneath that he had read a steadily growing hostility that some day would come to a head. And now the crisis seemed at hand. When it came it would mean—one thing. Yes: Peter and John's talk about the arrangement of the thrones had been premature. They had more usefully discussed the arrangement of prison-cells. The days of promise and prospect in Galilee were over now: before was hostile Judea and the Master bent on going there. It had come to the end—more quickly, more inevitably, more *fatally* than even in his gloomiest hours he had ever thought.

Well—and here spoke the heroic Thomas—if it had: what then? At least there is something to hold to. At least one can be faithful, loyal, brave. If we are not to be kings, at least we need not be cowards and traitors. We looked to share the Master's success: we can share His failure. We thought to live with Him: "let us also go that we may die with Him." Our dreams have gone; our duty remains—the duty of faithfulness, of honour, of courage. Come what may—and only one thing can come—it is better to be true than base, to be brave than craven. Let us go to Jerusalem!

Not a syllable of murmuring against the Master. Not a suggestion of "I knew it." Not a thought of personal

escape. In the approach of the crisis, which none of the disciples had ever foreseen, but which Thomas more than any of the others must have foreshadowed, this man was the first, the firmest, the most faithful.

And so that little band went up, silent, apprehensive, troubled, to Jerusalem. It was the journey of which in St. Mark's Gospel we have such a striking detail. "They were in the way," says the evangelist, "going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus went before them, and they were amazed, and as they followed they were afraid." Why has no artist ever painted the group? Ahead, alone, rapt in thought, the Master, conscious that already He was entering on the Via Dolorosa: the twelve coming after, perplexed and alarmed, and of them first, with stern face, but with firm footstep, Thomas.

Such is the first glimpse we have of that disciple whose position in the apostolic band many have been inclined to look on rather disparagingly.

We hear no more of Thomas till he reappears in the gathering of the little company in the upper room. The disciples were troubled and sad. Their Master had spoken of betrayal at the hands of one of themselves, and of His approaching departure whither they could not follow Him. Silence and gloom crept over the eleven—the traitor had gone forth—as Jesus spoke thus. The Master saw the sad faces, and began to cheer them. "Let not your hearts be troubled," He said, and went on to speak words of comfort and encouragement. His words doubtless lifted the clouds from most of their minds. But not from at least one. The impression of what it would mean to them if their Master were gone was not so quickly removed from the mind of Thomas. His appreciation of real fact, his realization of an actual situation made him feel dissatisfied with the general exhortation "Believe in God," and the unanalysed statement, "Ye know whither I go." These words may

have soothed the others: happy for the moment to hear their Master's voice speaking sweetly and tenderly, they did not care to examine too exactly what He said. But Thomas's mind was different. It was not in the face of a situation so real and terrible, to be quieted with vague comfort, or with words that did not seem to cover an actual fact. Was the dread emptiness of the Master's departure from them, who owed everything to Him, and were nothing without Him, met by His saying mysteriously, "Whither I go ye know"? They did *not* know. They knew He was going to an unknown betrayal, probably into the hands of His deadly foes. The situation was too real, too serious for unexplained words. He looked at John, still resting on his dear, near Master's breast; he looked at Peter, full of the inward resolve he would yet show Jesus what stuff he was made of by following Him to the end. He looked at the others. Did one of them realize that perhaps in a day their Master's place would be vacant, and they would be left leaderless, with the vague words echoing in their ears, "Ye know the way whither I have gone?" It was a moment of solemnity and peace and holy beauty. The Master was speaking tender words, as only He could be tender. They were alone. It seemed profane to interrupt. But Thomas could not forget the realities that lay just outside the door, and awaited on the morrow, and he burst in with the contradiction and the question: "Lord, we know *not* whither Thou goest, and how *can* we know the way?"

I repeat, Thomas was not a doubter so much as a realist. The interruption sounded unbelieving, but it was not the words of an unbeliever. It was the serious enquiry of a man who realized what the future would be without Jesus, and so demanded a comfort that should be real and true. There is a scrutiny and even a denial of the words of the very Master Himself which may be more truly honouring to Him than an acceptance of them which is not insincere,

but easy. It is no light thing to receive the Gospel in any form. That God is really my Father, that my sins can be forgiven, that dear dead ones are safe with Christ, and that to-morrow we shall see them again—I do not understand, nor do I even envy the man who accepts all that with a facile faith.

The third scene in which Thomas appears in the evangelical narrative is after the Crucifixion. It is the double scene in which he first refuses to believe his fellow disciple's report that Jesus was risen again, and afterwards is approached by Jesus Himself. It is, of course, this scene, and especially his saying in it, that he would not believe unless he put his fingers into the marks of the nails, that have gained for Thomas the title of the doubter. But not even here is the title really appropriate, or, in any disparaging sense, deserved.

Look at the situation and Thomas in it. Think of him as a man whose whole mind was powerfully impressed by the actual, who did not easily forget things or ignore things. Then think of the Crucifixion. Consider how that most dread of all realities in history must have burned itself into Thomas's mind and memory. Could anything efface it? Did he ever cease to hear the sickening hammering of the nails, or for a moment fail to see the dropping blood, the increasing pallor of that face, the slowly stiffening limbs? He seemed to see or hear nothing else. He seemed to know nothing else than the one fact, that every hour of the day reiterated—Jesus is dead. From his absence when Christ first appeared to the disciples, Thomas seems to have chosen to be alone with his memories rather than even with his and his Master's friends. This was not due, as subsequent events showed, to any separation from them; perhaps it was only accidental. But Thomas would feel the utter futility of their meeting and talking. For He round whom they had met and to whom they had talked was dead. A

death, even an ordinary death, is the most real and the most final of facts. Think how such a death as that on Calvary of such an one as his Lord and Master must have impressed itself, like a colossal bar of iron, on the mind of a man such as Thomas.

And when this fact was not yet a week old, just as it was emerging from being merely stunning into even clearer realization, one morning the other disciples met him with glad faces and excited voices, saying, "We have seen the Lord!" The grave man's face never altered. Their buoyancy never even for a moment affected him. Dull hammering echoed again in his ears: a sunken head, a rigid form again appeared before his vision. Shall he deny? Shall he dispute? Shall he even question? To believe did not occur to him. What was the use of speaking? Why even interfere with this strange, passing reaction from despair? Quietly and simply he replied: "Except I shall see in His hands the print of the nails, and put my fingers into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into His side, I will not believe."

It was as if he said: "Some story, some dream, some idea may make you thus glad, and God forbid I should seek to damp your day's joy. But as for me: I watched the Master die; I saw the nails driven home, the spear thrust in; I saw the heart's blood drained; I heard His last cry, and saw His head sink. I saw the end—the end. All these are facts that nothing can alter. Ideas and visions do not alter what has been, what is. If I am to hope again, give me like facts—that printed hand, that torn side. Till then, as I leave you to your joy, leave me to my gloom."

Again, here is not the doubter so much as the realist. The very reiteration of the concrete "print of the nails" shows it. This answer of Thomas is sometimes blamed as a presumptuous dictation of the method by which he demanded to be satisfied. This is to misunderstand

Thomas. As was said at the outset of this paper, a man of his temperament is easily misunderstood. He did not mean to propose this as a test to be taken literally: he meant it as an indication of the *kind* of support he needed—namely real facts, not mere stories and visions and rumours. It was not the artificial criticism of a superior person, or the carping objection of an unbeliever, or even the intellectual difficulty of a doubter, but the earnest necessitous demand of a mind that had been so impressed by real, outward, concrete facts, that only similar facts could remove the impression.

And when that which his nature needed was given him, when with gracious exactness the risen Master took Thomas at his word and said, "Reach hither thy finger and behold My hands and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into My side," how adoring yet how articulate was the apostle's confession of faith: "My Lord and my God." The words that Jesus added are not, I think, to be taken as a reproof for anything Thomas had said or done, but rather as an encouragement to that side of his nature in which he was more deficient. Jesus understood and appreciated men far too deeply to blame that one of his disciples whose following of Him had been on at least one critical occasion so noble, and all through had been so peculiarly laborious. It is not the high attainment Christ praises but the honest effort, not the stumbling step he censures but the false will. And Thomas's effort was honest and his will was never false. He was honest in committing himself to Christ's cause: honest in following bare duty, when all else seemed to have failed: honest in his interruption in the upper room: honest in his turning from what seemed to him the futile story of the Lord's appearance: honest, in the end, in his adoring confession. Faith, peace, joy, simplicity,—all these and other things are desirable and Christ may desire that

we should possess them ; but after all the one thing that even He may *demand* of a man is honesty. The lesson of Thomas's life is not, as many read it, an apology for doubting, but faithfulness to the light we have. In our day, when life and thought are so complex, we may learn much from the realist among the disciples,—as much perhaps as from any other. At times when we cannot with John's eagle eye pierce through the clouds to a vision of the peace and joy and beauty and victory beyond, let the earnest mind and firm foot of Thomas show us the next step. And to us too the Lord of truth, who is the rewarder of all them that diligently seek Him, will be gracious, and may assure our lonely, labouring spirits of His presence by means—in the actual discipline of our life—as real, as direct and as personally apt as when He said to Thomas, “Behold My hands.”

P. CARNEGIE SIMPSON.

*NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING ON THE SECOND
COMING OF CHRIST.*

VI. ITS SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE.

THE practical agreement of the various and very different writers of the New Testament is, apart from any special infallibility or authority of Holy Scripture, complete historical proof that the Founder of Christianity left upon the minds of His immediate followers a firm conviction that in visible bodily form He will return from heaven to earth to close the present order of things, to raise the dead, to judge all men, and to bring in the everlasting glory. Now it is in the last degree unlikely that in this important matter all the early followers of Christ, the men who won for Him the homage of all future generations and through whose agency He became the Saviour of the world, were in serious error touching the teaching of their Master. The unlikeliness of this alternative compels us to believe that the unanimous conviction of His followers was a correct re-echo of the actual teaching of Christ. We therefore ask, What bearing has this teaching, now traced to His lips, upon the spiritual life of our own day? Is it to us merely a matter of antiquarian interest, or is it, or may it be, amid the progress of modern thought, helpful to the spiritual life of the servants of Christ?

It may be at once admitted that the doctrine before us cannot occupy in our thought the place it filled in the minds of the first generation of Christians. Indeed, it does not occupy in the longer and later and more mature epistles of Paul the position it holds in his two earliest letters. In the systematic exposition of the Gospel given in the Epistle to the Romans, it receives only slight mention, and has no place in the main argument. So also in the sublime Epistle to

the Ephesians. In the Fourth Gospel, which contains the fullest development in the New Testament of the doctrine of the Son of God, it is not conspicuous. Important as it is, the doctrine of the Second Coming of Christ cannot be placed on a level, as a fundamental doctrine of the Gospel, with the superhuman dignity of Christ, His resurrection from the dead, the pardon of sins through faith in Him and through His death for the sins of men, and the gift of the Holy Spirit to be, in the servants of Christ, the inward source of a new life. It is, however, an integral part, in the second rank of importance, of the Gospel of Christ.

That the doctrine before us pertains to the future, warns us to interpret with utmost caution the teaching which we have traced to the lips of Christ. The fulfilment, in Christ and Christianity, of the ancient prophecies given to Israel differs greatly both from the expectations roused and from the letter of the prophecies. Doubtless it will be so in the Second Coming of Christ. All we can expect with confidence is that, in the latter as in the former, the realisation will, in all real worth, surpass the letter of the promise. Touching the return of Christ, we expect such a fulfilment as might be most suitably foretold to men in the form we find in the New Testament.

In our search for the reality underlying this teaching, we may learn something from 2 Thessalonians i. 7, and 1 Corinthians i. 7, where the return for which His followers were waiting is described as "the revelation (or unveiling) of the Lord Jesus." In other words, the veil which now hides from mortal view the eternal realities will in that day be raised or rent. In this rent veil we have a definite conception of the coming of Christ. It will be a bursting in, upon the visible universe, of the great Invisible beyond and above it, in order that the Invisible may transform and glorify the visible.

This expectation of a bursting in of the Unseen implies,

and is the strongest conceivable expression of, a conviction that behind and beyond and above the visible universe is a greater world unseen. Upon this conviction rests the Christian hope and all religious life.

On every side we see a universe of apparently unlimited extent. And it seems to be as durable as it is firm and broad. Indeed the planets in their orbits and the so-called fixed stars in their scarcely-perceptible movements seem to be a visible embodiment of eternity itself. In contrast to the solid earth on which we tread, with firm but passing steps, and the starry heavens above our heads, we seem to be butterflies of a summer or like leaves of the forest opening in the bright green springtime only to pass away in the decay of autumn.

To assert, as is implied in the New Testament teaching about the Second Coming of Christ, that an hour will strike in which the visible universe, whose age reaches back through unnumbered millenniums, will pass away, is to assert the existence of a world greater and older and more durable than the solid earth, on which so many generations of men have lived and died, and all that belongs to it; and of forces or a force controlling the natural forces which seem to control irresistibly all human life. In other words, a belief in the Second Coming of Christ is the strongest possible contradiction to the Materialism which asserts or suggests that the things which are seen and the forces observed operating in them are the only matters certainly known to man.

The teaching of Christ that the visible universe will not abide for ever has received remarkable confirmation in our own day from Natural Science. All modern research teaches that the material universe is tending towards a state in which life will be impossible, that the forces of nature are carrying it irresistibly forward to the silence of death. In this, as in other respects, the life of an individual is an epitome of the life of the race and of the world.

Beyond that silence and quiescence, Natural Science can see nothing. Herbert Spencer timidly suggests¹ that possibly the forces which are destroying the universe will, by some reverse action, bring it back to life. But, for this suggestion, he has no proof or presumption to bring. It is a mere hope for which Science finds no foundation, suggested as a disguise to hide the eternal night which is all that Natural Science can foretell.

Christ taught, not only that the present universe is passing away, but that, just as it has its source in an Unseen greater than itself, by which it is controlled, so it will be succeeded by another world far greater than that which we see around us, and destined to abide for ever. He taught that the solid earth beneath us is but a temporary platform for the passing drama of man's probation, and that when the drama is over the platform erected for it will be removed, to give place for the abiding reality for which that drama is the preparation. This teaching is the only explanation of the present material universe, apparently so durable yet manifestly doomed to pass away; and of human life upon it, apparently so transitory and yet of so much greater value than its material environment.

We now see that the Second Coming of Christ, as taught by Himself, is the strongest possible assertion that the material and visible, though apparently so important and so stable, are actually subordinate and transitory; and that the spiritual, apparently so intangible and transitory, is the enduring and the real. In no other form could this great truth, which underlies all religion and all the highest morality, have been so clearly and so forcefully stated as in the teaching which in these papers we have traced to the lips of the Great Teacher who has remoulded for good the thought and life of man.

The return of Christ depicted in the New Testament will

¹ *First Principles*, pp. 529ff.

be a complete and abiding victory and dominion of mind over matter. In this life, matter fetters mind in a thousand ways. The necessities of bodily life compel us to spend time in more or less degrading toil. Physical causes produce pain, and thus hinder mental effort. The intelligence of man is held down in its upward flight by its material environment. Now St. Paul teaches expressly, in 1 Corinthians xv. 35, 44, that the risen servants of Christ will have bodies. This can only mean that at His return their disembodied spirits will again clothe themselves in material forms. But, whereas their present bodies are "psychical,"¹ which I understand to mean that they are governed by the laws of animal life, their risen bodies will be "spiritual," *i.e.* controlled altogether by the intelligent spirit within. At present the nobler element in man is fettered, and in large measure controlled, by the lower. The teaching of St. Paul in 1 Corinthians xv. 44-46 asserts that this inversion is only transitory and preparatory, and that in the great consummation the element which is essentially higher will rule and that which is lower will receive its highest possible dignity by becoming the submissive organ of that which is greater than itself.

Still more conspicuously will the coming of Christ be the absolute and eternal victory of good over evil. In the present order of things, not unfrequently evil seems to trample under foot the good. The wicked flourish, and for a long time. The righteous suffer, and sometimes lose life itself because they are good and others around are bad. But the majesty of the Moral Sense of Man, which speaks with an authority we cannot gainsay, assures us that this triumph cannot last. Indeed the moral incongruity of this occasional triumph demands a conspicuous and universally recognised vindication of the majesty of Right. All this prepares us to expect an exact and eternal retribution for all actions

¹ A.V. and R.V. "natural."

good and bad. Moreover, so closely interwoven is human action with its material environment, nearer and more remote, and the imperfection of present retribution is so closely related to its present imperfect environment, that we wonder not that the perfect retribution will be accompanied by a new and perfect material environment. Only in a New Earth and Heaven, and in bodies raised from the dead to die no more, will every one receive according as his work has been.

The resurrection of the body will be the complete and permanent realisation of the creative purpose of God. He made man spirit and body, in order that the spirit might rule the body and make it the organ of the spirit's self-manifestation, and in order that thus both spirit and body might attain their highest well-being. This purpose and this order were disturbed and for a time frustrated by sin. The body threw off the yoke of the Spirit within; and, the original purpose being inverted, both spirit and body sank into discord and bondage. But, that He might restore the order thus disturbed, the Eternal Son, Himself the Arche-type of all created intelligence, entered into human flesh and became Man. In those who receive Him, He at once rescues the spirit, in some measure, from bondage to its material environment, nearer and more remote. But the rescue is only partial. Christ will come again to redeem even the bodies of His people, and, as St. Paul believed,¹ their further material environment, from the bondage of decay. He will thus, by restoring the normal relation of spirit to body and of man to his entire material environment, achieve the purpose for which man and the universe were created.

This victory of mind over matter and of good over evil, and this accomplishment of the creative purpose of God, can be brought about only by some such event as a resur-

¹ See Romans viii. 19-23.

rection of the dead and a renovation of the material universe. It cannot be accomplished by the hand of death. For death sunders that which God created to be closely interwoven. It is a victory of matter over mind, of evil over good. Lips which spoke for Christ are silent in the grave, silent in some cases because they spoke so bravely and so well. The fugitive spirits of His servants have been driven naked from the bodies and from the world in which they once served Him. This cannot be for ever. The fugitives must return and claim their own. The world must receive back those whom it once disowned. And all this can be done only by some such dissolution and renovation of nature and resurrection of the dead as is described in the New Testament.

The relation between our present and future bodies, and between the material universe around us now and that new order of things which will abide for ever, is beyond our conception, and need not trouble us. For in our present bodies is a constant flux of particles, which however does not destroy or weaken their continuity. It matters not whether the risen and glorified bodies will, or will not, contain a single particle present in the bodies laid in the grave. The essential point is that the spirits driven forth by death from the material forms in which they lived and served God and from the visible universe will survive that universe and will robe themselves again in glorified material forms. At the same time, a wide and deep analogy seems to suggest a real, though to us utterly inconceivable, continuity or relation between the present battlefield and the scene of the final triumph, and between the bodies once devoted on earth to the service of Christ and those on whose brows will rest the unfading crown.

The hope of a bodily resurrection and of a new earth and heaven gives dignity and worth to matter. For it implies that matter, be it what it may, is not a passing, but an abiding, companion of mind. And this abiding union is suggested

irresistibly by the very intimate relation now existing. It is meet, as is suggested in Philippians iii. 21, that the bodies which have been obedient organs of the spirit should share its redemption and glory. But in what sense or measure this is possible, we know not.

That this victory of mind over matter, of good over evil, and this complete realisation of the purpose for which man was created, are connected with Christ, and with His bodily return to earth, need not surprise us. For the incarnation of the Creator Son gave to matter a new and infinite dignity. Moreover, in that sacred human body evil achieved its most terrible victory over good, and matter inflicted on mind its deepest humiliation. In some measure that victory was reversed at the resurrection of Christ. He then triumphantly rescued from the grave the body which had been the victim of death's triumph. But the triumph of Christ was incomplete. The Creator had entered, in human form, a revolted province in order to bring it back to His peaceful and blessed sway. Without having done this, He returned from a world which had rejected Him. But He took with Him into the unseen world a handful of human dust; and placed it upon the throne of heaven. He thus severed that which was designed to be one; and took from the material universe its most highly honoured part.

Earth claims back that handful of dust; or rather the handful of dust claims the world of which once it was a part. The separation cannot be abiding. He who, after being driven from earth by man's deepest sin, returned into the body once nailed to the cross will return again, bringing back the handful of dust from heaven to earth, in order that its touch may raise earth to heaven.

Since the dead servants of Christ were on earth, and now are in His nearer presence, vitally united to Him, we wonder not that their departed spirits will accompany their returning Lord. And, since they were created body and

spirit, we wonder not that they, like their Lord ages ago, will robe themselves again in material forms. And since, both as Creator and Redeemer, Christ claims the homage and obedience of all His rational creatures, we wonder not that at His return He will sit in judgment on all men living and dead.

Thus in Christ and by His return from heaven to earth will be accomplished fully the purpose for which the world and man were created. The orderly accomplishment was disturbed by sin; and this disturbance could be removed only by the suffering and death of the Incarnate Son, Himself the Agent of creation. A pledge of the accomplishment was given in the resurrection, ascension, and enthronement of the Crucified. His return to earth will bring the full realisation of the entire purpose of God.

Touching the present condition of the departed servants of Christ, the New Testament does not say much. But every reference to them implies or suggests a state of consciousness and rest in the presence of Christ, a presence so near that, compared with it, their intercourse with Him on earth was absence. So 2 Corinthians v. 6, 8: "Absent from the body . . . at home with the Lord." Also Philippians i. 23, Luke xxiii. 43, Revelation vi. 11.

The long waiting of the departed for their full reward need not perplex us. To the Unseen we cannot apply notions of time and delay derived from the present life. Suffice for us that the righteous dead are already resting with Christ from the toil and conflict of earth; and that in His good time they and we together shall enter the glory which in that day will be revealed.

For that day we wait. Not the death of the body, which is a penalty of sin and a victory of the powers of darkness, but the return of Christ in bodily form to reign over His faithful ones, their own bodies rescued from death and the grave, is the aim and goal of our exultant hope. For that

return His early followers eagerly waited. And their eager hope suggested that perhaps they might hear His voice and see His face without passing under the dark shadow of death. That eager expectation was not fulfilled. And we cannot share it. But, long as the time seems, that day will come. Had we witnessed the creation of matter, and known the long ages predestined to elapse before rational man would stand on the earth, our expectation would have wearied at the long delay. But those long ages rolled by; and for thousands of years our planet has teemed with rational life. So will pass by whatever ages remain before our Lord's return. Many reasons suggest that, though not close at hand, it cannot be very long delayed. Doubtless we shall lay us down for our last sleep. But in our sleep we shall dream of Him and be with Him. And when the morning dawns we shall wake up in the splendour of the rising Sun.

YES, I COME QUICKLY.

AMEN. COME, LORD JESUS.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

[Since writing the above, my attention has been called to *The Great Day of the Lord*, by Rev. Alex. Brown, of which a second edition has just appeared. The writer assumes, in deference to certain passages in the New Testament, that the return of Christ there foretold took place in the first century; and supposes that all was fulfilled at the destruction of Jerusalem. His argument is based chiefly on the Book of Revelation, to which he devotes 254 out of 399 pages. The teaching of St. Paul occupies, except sundry casual references, only 44 pages.

On page 257 we read:—"To sum the whole into a sentence—with the fall of Jerusalem, the then existing age was ended, the dead were judged, the saints were raised to heaven, and a new dispensation of a world-wide order insti-

tuted, of which Christ is everlasting King, and ever present with His people, whether living here or dead beyond." On page 266, as an exposition of John vi. 39, we read:—" 'The last day' is easily interpreted. It is the last day of the age, the Judaic age then running, and was a popular phrase for the time when the higher Messianic privileges would be given to the people of God." In reference to Matthew xxv. 31, he says, on page 319:—"The judgment scene must take its beginning in the period immediately succeeding the downfall of Jerusalem."

As an example of his exegesis, I quote from page 220, in reference to 1 Thessalonians iv. 15-17:—"Αμα (together) may express the idea of *place* as well as of *time*, and in the New Testament most frequently carries the idea of *identity of quality*, and might well be translated 'likewise.' The word is radically identical with the Sanscrit *samâ*, Latin *simul*, Gothic *sama*, English *same*. In this light, it is seen that Paul instructs the Thessalonians only to this effect, that they, though not dead at the second coming, will afterwards be caught up in similar manner to the dead, to meet them and be for ever in their blessed society." The above is an example of the loose exegesis and smattering of scholarship which meet us throughout the book. I notice with surprise that a work so unsatisfactory has received from the press no small commendation.

I cannot close this series of papers without a tribute of honour to a veteran theologian, whom God still spares to us, Dr. David Brown of Aberdeen. His work on *The Second Advent* has long been, and still is, in my opinion, the best on the subject. It is worthy of careful study.]

THE LEADING SCRIPTURAL METAPHOR.

THE WAY.

IT is proposed in this paper to follow up one of the clearest and most characteristic of those figures in Holy Scripture which serve to reveal the conditions and experiences of the spiritual life. That there is in the Bible a wealth of such illustrations every student readily admits, but the admission is one thing, patient investigation and acquisition is another. Few careful readers of the Scriptures are now content to regard its imagery as due merely to the imaginative colouring of Eastern minds, but if they do not regard it as quite superfluous, their tendency is to regard it from the wrong standpoint, viz., as if types and figures were designed to conceal and obscure, and not to illuminate and make manifest truths which could not, from the nature of the case, be otherwise conveyed. But as the written revelation is so largely presented in this parabolic method, it seems an imperative duty that those who value it should enquire into this characteristic presentation of its truths. It will therefore help to serve this purpose if a first selection is offered of the most persistent and most striking of the Scriptural metaphors, and an attempt is made to mark its underlying significance. On what principles, it may be asked, will this selection be made? The importance of a metaphor is indicated not so much by its frequency as by the following considerations.

(a) By the fact that all the greatest and most suggestive figures of the spiritual life are seen to be common to both Testaments, *i.e.*, they are equally applicable to the circumstances of Jewish polity, or to the life and conditions of the Universal Church. Of these figures there is not only a persistent and continuous employment, but they have a catholic character about them. Their suggestiveness is not for one time or people, but eternal and universal.

(b) As a consequence of this, such metaphors appeal to the general experience of mankind. The moment a metaphor is used, the force of which could only be appreciated by a Jew, or a Greek, or a Roman, then, however interesting it may prove to the student, it is seen not to be of a supreme and commanding significance—it falls into the lower and less important category of figures.

(c) The careful student of Scripture metaphors will soon observe that those which are at once most persistent and most striking have a historical character about them. Their antecedents lie far back, and are engraven upon the annals of the people of Jehovah's choice. The way, the warfare, the building—who is not aware of the pre-eminence of these figures? and who is there who cannot see them already writ large in the history of Israel? They are no more accidental in the literature of Scripture than were the crises of the Exodus and the Exile, or the struggles with the aborigines and the nations around, or the erection of the first and second temple, in the long discipline of the Jewish people.

(d) It is not too much to infer design in the employment of the greater metaphors. Metaphors are common to all literature; but in that which is uninspired, even in the Epics of Homer or Vergil, or in the *Divina Commedia*, they appear with whatever felicity of employment, or grace of usage, without any consistency of design. They serve their turn—to arrest attention, to charm the ear, to catch the eye, but their presence is accidental, the impression is momentary. Not so with the great figures of the spiritual life in Scripture. They do more, and are designed to do more, than arrest a casual attention; in their proportions and character they insist upon permanent recognition, they claim intimate acquaintance, and as an integral part of the written revelation their earnest study becomes not only a delightful intellectual pursuit, but a fruitful method for the

discipline of the heart and will and of the whole human character.

(e) There is yet another note of these greater figures of Holy Scripture. They are germinant. Out of them spring other lesser metaphors—offshoots from a parent stock. Or, to put it otherwise, there are branch lines which stretch away in different directions from the main lines of metaphor, serving for communication of a subordinate importance, not passing boldly and directly from one end to the other of the revelation, but traversing portions of its vast expanse, and thus not of universal scope and tendency.

It follows from these considerations that to trace any main line of Scripture metaphor cannot prove a mere word study. The act must become such a reverent lifting of the veil as is permitted from man's side. If a revelation is in its essential character parabolic and figurative, then the more these images and types are apprehended in their proportion and mutual relation, the farther the open eye will be enabled to see the wondrous things which are finally to be discerned in all their completeness. There will remain mysteries still, but it is a comfortable assurance that there is a human stewardship of such mysteries, that there is given to men, however unequal they may be to the responsibility, the sacred charge of their administration. Who can doubt that it will be a part of the ampler revelation of the life of heaven to discern the full significance of that which is conveyed, in a riddle, by the imagery which characterises through and through the written Word?

The humblest contribution to such an enterprise must, however, bring its own sad misgivings. For this unusual task is not merely hindered by diffidence of the enquirer's intellectual capacity to carry it through, but by the deeper hesitation as to spiritual gifts. For here scholarship fails, and mental power fails, and the revelation denied to these is given to the childlike heart. Yet in this spirit the venture

may be taken, and a reverent consideration be invited of the first and most striking of all Christian metaphors, viz., the Way.

An examination into the words which stand in the Old and New Testaments as its equivalents need not detain us long, for this is a very simple undertaking.

There are two general terms in Hebrew, "derech" and "orach," which signify respectively a trodden or ordinary path, a pathway. Practically interchangeable expressions, they stand distinguished from other terms, which mark a "via munita" as the national or public road—the king's highway. Of these two terms "derech" is one of the most common in the Hebrew vocabulary, and is employed in the Old Testament at least five hundred times. It has three stages of meaning: first, the action of walking; then, by transference, a pathway; then, by further transference into the metaphorical sphere, a mode, a course, a method, or discipline.

The common equivalent in the LXX. for דֶּרֶךְ is ὁδὸς, and this again stands almost uniformly in the New Testament whenever the Hebrew word is in reference.¹

Ὀδὸς starts in its significance at one stage nearer the metaphorical sense. It is first a way, then a course, method, or mode of thinking and living; with this exception, the two words stand, as it were, linked together in primitive meaning and after application. This close *rapport* between the two words, Hebrew and Greek, added to the frequency of their employment in the Old and New Testament, is of importance as suggesting an underlying idea wide enough to attract and claim the attention of the Jewish or Hellenic mind. The Way is a metaphor with the mark of catholicity about it. If it only bore the impress upon it of its historical antecedents, then the Jewish idea would have been lost

¹ Cf. the quotation in all four Evangelists of Is. xl. 3: St. Matt. iii. 3, St. Mark i. 3, St. Luke iii. 4, St. John i. 23.

to the Greek ; if it only bore the conception of some swift passage from point to point, then it would not have been so readily assimilated by a Hebrew. It is singular indeed that in the New Testament we have in this capital instance an illustration of one of those branch lines of metaphor extending off the main line. Thus the Pauline figure of a race may be noted as a development of the figure of the way ; but while the former is graphic and picturesque in the highest degree, its suggestions are not for Jews, but for those Greek, and Latin, and Teutonic races to whom the games and the racecourse meant and mean so much. The metaphor of the race is by comparison accidental, temporary, local ; pertinent and suggestive as it is, it is not on the main line.¹

One cannot fail to observe the historic ancestry of the metaphor of the Way. It lies embedded in the records of Israel when it first emerged into national existence. It is sufficient to recall the name of the second book of the Old Testament. The idea of the Way was burnt into Jewish consciences as often as they recalled, or as the national festivals recalled the experiences of the forty years in the wilderness. The attendances of pilgrims at these festivals impressed them continually afresh upon the mind—and then, as if the nation could never be suffered to lose sight of the idea, the second great crisis in the national life, the captivity at Babylon, and the returns, once more forced the idea of the way into the prominence it claimed.

Pari passu with the impress wrought upon the idea by historical association is seen a growing ethical significance. The Way was ever towards a Divine presence, undertaken by a Divine invitation, and under Divine guidance, with a divinely promised blessing in store. Israel under Moses,

¹ The teaching of our Lord on the "broad" and "narrow" way is itself a development of the original figure. Students of the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* will remember its reproduction there.

the faithful and happy pilgrim to the house of his God, the worn-out exile returning to the ruined home of his sires, all these must have felt the way to be symbolic. This ideal route became to them significant of the spiritual life, of its trials and discipline, of its claims and responsibilities, of its fears and hopes, and its triumphant issue. References to the Old Testament might be given, but they are too numerous to make quotation necessary.

The employment of this figure, stands alone by position and in suggestiveness in Biblical literature. It is indeed true that the teaching of Mahomet has some fine moral hints—in the doctrine of the four ways. But while the underlying idea seems borrowed from Scriptural source, it is weakened in its presentation through the Koran by artificiality and lack of directness. To see it presented anywhere else than in Scripture one must turn to the immortal allegory of John Bunyan.¹ The fame of this masterpiece of literature rests simply on the fact that the author had the fine spiritual instinct to fasten upon the leading Scriptural metaphor and to present it to his readers with marvellous vividness, and suggestiveness. When another Bunyan appears to do like justice to other Scriptural metaphors, they too will be adequately impressed upon the human conscience and heart.

In the *Pilgrim's Progress* the Way indeed becomes luminous. With extraordinary fidelity to Scripture, it runs right through the narrative; it is not crudely forced upon the attention, but it claims the soul's clear vision; and as we tread the path with Christian and his brave comrades from the city of destruction to the celestial home awaiting them across the river, every step in the journey appeals to the heart, reminding it, if it be tender and loyal, of the danger of straying from the right way and of the glorious recom-

¹ Much of the power as of the picturesqueness of the *Purgatorio* surely is due to this same standing figure of a way.

pense following upon the nearer, closer walk with God. Bunyan's work might at least assure those who have studied and love it of the great gain which comes from realizing the spiritual life and experience as a pilgrimage from earth to heaven. His imaginative power is of course extremely rare, but there is no manner of reason why Christian people should not remind themselves more often of the teaching of the Way. As they undertake some commonplace journey, or better, as they walk in some fair country scenes like Clopas and, it may be, St. Luke, his companion, not merely "looking up through nature to nature's God," but full of thought, now serious and sad, now bright and brave, an effort to picture this as a metaphor of the soul's progress need become no mere idle flight of fancy, but a bracing cheering conception for life, one full of high and holy teaching.

It remains to consider this main line of Scriptural metaphor as it stretches across the pages of the New Testament. The student will be aware that the figure is rarer in occurrence than in the Old Testament. It has also lost somewhat, from the nature of the case, of the strength of its historical association, but it is more important to observe that a fresh turn is given to the metaphorical sense of Ὁδὸς. An examination into the passages in which the expression occurs in the earliest history of the Church shows that it was the popular term for describing the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth.¹ The term, it will be noted, is now in use in this sense, not only by Christians themselves but by those who were indifferent, or strongly antagonistic to the faith. There must be some cause adequate to account for the new departure in sense. Why was the Christian life and discipline now termed by friends and foes alike as the Way? The answer lies in the

¹ Cf. Acts ix. 2, xiv. 23, xvi. 17, xviii. 25, 26, xix. 9 22, xxi. 4, xxiv. 14, 22.

record of the Gospels. It is sufficient to quote the enquiry of St. Thomas and the answer of the Lord.¹ There once for all in reply to him, who not here alone appears as the representative of the doubt and anxiety of Christians, Christ declares Himself the fulfilment of the great figure of the ancient Scriptures. I am the Way.

It is not for a moment to be supposed that this sublime interpretation was given on this occasion alone, but the saying sank deep into the hearts of the Apostles, and so passed by natural communication from lip to lip, from letter to letter—to the instruction and comfort of the Church of the first ages. The saying did not seem “hard” to those who had walked with the Master by the shores of Galilee or had passed with Him on the upland slopes of Judæa, or had followed His feet in the streets of Jerusalem. But their anxieties were to vanish and their doubts to be presently cleared. The Way was to be made luminous through His passion, His resurrection, and by that crowning event by which the kingdom of heaven is opened still to all believers.

Life lies at the root of the Christian faith, and life must be the key to all its symbolism. In the life beyond, the Church triumphant shall discern the truth which the Church militant still strives to reach, that Christ is the living Way. Yet even now no patient pursuit in our earthly pilgrimage of His adorable example shall be without its final reward in the rest that remains for the people of God; every hope is summed up in Christ—every fear is calmed by Him. What the Old Testament saints dimly foresaw the Church universal joyously accepts—He is the Way.

B. WHITEFOORD.

¹ St. John xiv. 4, 5, 6.

HOW DOES THE GOSPEL OF MARK BEGIN?

THE reader will answer this question: "Without any possibility of doubt, as all manuscripts and editions give it: Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, the only question being, whether after Χριστοῦ there is to be added υἱοῦ [τοῦ] Θεοῦ or not."

On the latter point Westcott-Hort quote a very interesting passage from *Severian*, the Syrian Bishop of Gabala about 401, on which they say:

"If the text be sound, his MS. must have had a separate heading, ἀρχὴ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Θεοῦ, followed by a fresh *beginning of the text* without υ.θ., and such a *reduplication of the opening words in the form of a heading* might in this case easily arise from conflation."

Now it occurs to me that just the contrary has taken place in the ordinary MSS.: not the opening words of the text were repeated in form of a heading, but the heading, the title of the book, became the opening of the text. There are good reasons, I believe, for this view.

First of all—what no critical editor has as yet noticed—the *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum*, as published by Miniscalchi-Erizzo and De Lagarde, has not ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, but merely {ⲙⲁⲗⲗⲟⲩ ⲱⲣⲁⲛⲟⲩ ⲥⲓⲃⲟⲩ ⲥⲓⲃⲁⲛⲟⲩ, i.e. *Eὐαγγέλιον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (ⲥⲓⲃⲟⲩ = *κυρίου*, in this version must remain unnoticed).

Now this is a most natural and, as it seems to me, the original, heading or title of the book.

And very natural, again, it is, that, when the four Gospels were first written into *one* MS., that then to the end of the first Gospel an *Explicit*, and to the beginning of the second an "*Incipit*" was added, and from this came what we now

read:—ἀρχὴ τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου 'Ι. Χ., *i.e.* Here begins a new book, the Gospel of Jesus Christ (according to Mark).

The opening of the text, as it seems to me, was clearly: Καθὼς γέγραπται or Ὡς γέγραπται, and it is quite a mistake of *Tischendorf* to put a comma between Χριστοῦ (ver. 1) and καθὼς (ver. 2), and a full stop after αὐτοῦ (ver. 3). In this respect, Westcott-Hort have shown a much better judgment in printing verse 1 as some sort of heading, and separating it from the following text. We must only go a little farther, as here indicated, and see in verse 1 the original title of the book, and not the opening of the text.

That ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου is an unnatural, and καθὼς or ὡς γέγραπται a most natural, opening of a book, will be best shown by the list of the *Initia* which Harnack-Preuschen published.¹ Not a single Christian book or treatise begins like the supposed beginning of Mark—with ἀρχὴ (for “ἀρχὴ τελειώσεως γνῶσις ἀνθρώπου,” quoted there, p. 167, is quite different), but three begin with καθάπερ, four with καθὼς,² 28 with ὡς, 16 with ὅσπερ. It is quite the same with the Latin book-beginnings—none with *initium* or *principium*, but 10 with *sicut*, 12 with *quomodo*.

There seems to me no doubt that:—

(1) The original title of the Gospel of Mark was

ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ

and its beginning Καθὼς γέγραπται.

(2) When the Gospels were gathered into one corpus, the first and second were separated by an *Explicit* and *Incipit*:—

ΑΡΧΗ ΤΟΥ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΥ Ι. Χ. (κατὰ Μάρκου).

(3) Still later, these words were taken as the beginning of the *text*, and by some editors and commentators, against

¹ In the *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*, I. 1893, pp. 988-1020.

² Among them the First Epistle to Timothy and another piece: καθὼς Ἡσαίας φησί.

all grammatical and stilistical rules, forced together with the real beginning—*Καθὼς γέγραπται*.

That the beginning of St. Matthew must be explained in a similar way, and again in the Old Testament the variation between the Greek and Hebrew text of Genesis ii. 4 (*βιβλος γενέσεως*), and Hosea i. 2, is for me not doubtful.

EBERHARD NESTLE.

Ulm.

SURVEY OF RECENT BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

INTRODUCTION.—Messrs. C. J. Clay & Sons have issued from the Cambridge University Press the third number of *Studia Sinaitica*. It contains a *Catalogue of the Arabic MSS. in the Convent of S. Catherine on Mount Sinai* compiled by Margaret Dunlop Gibson. Some idea of the labour involved in making this catalogue may be gathered from the facts that there are over 600 entries, that most of the books have lost both title-page and eolophon, and that Mrs. Gibson had only 40 days in which to complete her work. The MSS. are described in Greek, and one or two pages are reproduced by photography. They are various in contents, some being translations of Old and New Testament books, sermons, martyrologies, liturgies, lives of saints, books of spiritual counsel. Such a catalogue cannot fail to stimulate research and guide further investigation of the hidden treasures of monastic libraries.

The Syndics of the Cambridge University Press have also issued in a sumptuous quarto *The Four Gospels in Syriac, transcribed from the Sinaitic Palimpsest* by the late Robert M. Bensley, M.A., J. Rendel Harris, M.A., and F. Crawford Burkitt, M.A., with an introduction by Agnes Smith Lewis. One has only to look at the photographs of the MS. to understand the labour and skill required to transcribe it. All honour to the scholars who have accomplished so severe a task. Its importance is guaranteed by the fact that these experts thought it worth their while to make a journey to Mount Sinai for the purpose of seeing and transcribing this one MS. Mrs. Lewis in her introduction describes the steps by which she became aware of its value, and gives us all the information requisite except on the important point of date. The upper writing is dated but not the under; or at any rate, its date is not deciphered. Cureton's copy belongs to the latter half of the 5th century, and is incomplete, so that unquestionably this newly unearthed MS. is a very considerable find. The conclusions of critics and experts will be awaited with interest.

In connection with this, it may be mentioned that Messrs. Adam & Charles Black have reprinted from the *Encyclopædia Britannica* the article on Syriac Literature, contributed by the

late William Wright, LL.D., Prof. of Arabic in Cambridge. The volume is well printed and handy, and is called *A Short History of Syriac Literature*. Even as a memento of one of the greatest oriental scholars England has reared many must wish to possess the volume. In itself it is valuable as giving us in a compact and accessible form, information which few could otherwise gain at all, and which even the few could only gain with great toil. The literature of the Syrians may not be attractive, but there are parts of it, at any rate, which must be known by the Church historian, the theologian, and the textual critic.

Yet another edition of *The Didache* appears. It is compiled by Mr. Charles H. Hoole, M.A., and published by Mr. David Nutt. The first half of the small volume is occupied with an introduction in which *The Didache* is compared with the Epistle of Barnabas, the Shepherd of Hermas, the *Judicium Petri*, and the Apostolic Constitutions, with the result that Mr. Hoole concludes that *The Didache* is a compilation from those other writings. He further thinks that the *Didache* discovered by Bryennius was an abbreviated form of the work. Accordingly after printing the text of Bryennius he prints his own restoration of what he believes to be the original form. A translation of Bryennius' text concludes the work. It deserves the attention of critics.

Messrs. T. & T. Clark have issued in a very handsome form a translation by the Rev. William Affleck, B.D., of the first volume, all yet published, of Prof. Godet's *Introduction to the New Testament*. This volume contains the Introduction to the Pauline Epistles, and if the work is completed on the same scale and with the same thoroughness it will prove a formidable rival to the Introductions of Salmon and Weiss. As it is, this present instalment will at once take its place as an authoritative and standard work. If less lively than Prof. Salmon's interesting lectures, it is more complete; and while as learned and scholarly as Weiss, Prof. Godet is always intelligible to the lay reader. The book will receive fuller notice at a future time.

From the Congregational Sunday School and Publishing Society of Boston and Chicago, there has been issued *The Comprehensive Concordance to the Holy Scriptures* by the Rev. J. B. R. Walker. Its advantages are many. It contains 50,000 more references than Cruden; it is rigidly alphabetical in arrangement; it is more compact and handy than any other; it is well printed and ap-

parently well stitched, and it is cheap. It also contains a bibliographical introduction by M. C. Hayard, Ph.D. It deserves a hearty welcome and a wide circulation.

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.—The attractiveness of this department of inquiry is manifested by the vigour with which it is prosecuted. Already we have quite a Pauline library, bulky volumes traversing the entire field of this apostle's theology, and monographs dealing with one or other of its more important features. But we gladly find room on our shelves for Dr. Bruce's *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity* (Messrs. T. & T. Clark). For Dr. Bruce is never a mere echo, and often utters not merely an independent but a decisive word. The present volume ranges with his previous work, *The kingdom of God*, and is, on the whole, still more satisfactory, if rather less characteristic, than that incisive treatise. Any one who undertakes to write on Paulinism is necessarily to a greater or less extent guided by the need of being in touch with current speculation and enquiry. Throughout Dr. Bruce's volume there is evidence that he has made himself acquainted with the entire literature of the subject, and his singularly impartial and carefully-thought criticisms of the opinions advanced by other writers form one of the most instructive elements in his book. Once or twice, perhaps, these opinions deserved a somewhat fuller treatment than Dr. Bruce gives them. When a critic of the standing of Prof. Pfleiderer gives it as his deliberate judgment that Pauline thought is deeply tinged with Hellenism, we expect some more detailed refutation than the summary statement, "Speaking generally, I distrust this whole method of accounting for Paulinism by eclectic patchwork." This same criticism applies to Dr. Bruce's treatment of St. Paul's relation to Jewish theology. Apparently Dr. Bruce has not found this an interesting inquiry, and treats cavalierly those who believe that the Apostle carried over to Christianity a good deal he had learned from Gamaliel. There are other points which, in our opinion, called for fuller treatment. The objectivity of the vision on the road to Damascus is affirmed by Dr. Bruce (p. 32 and p. 393), but its bare affirmation in a single clause without grounds assigned is surely insufficient in the present state of criticism. So too, the assertion that Paul conceived of Christ as human even in the pre-existent state, is no doubt confirmed by high authorities; and yet one expects some more elabo-

rate statement of evidence than is here vouchsafed. Neither will all his readers agree with Dr. Bruce in thinking that a complete account of St. Paul's Christology can be derived from the four great epistles; and while all must admire the ingenuity he has shown in arranging these epistles in accordance with the doctrine they severally teach, there lingers in the mind a suspicion that he has applied just a little pressure to make them fit his scheme.

But, as the book stands, there need be no hesitation in pronouncing it the best treatment of Paulinism we have. Each of the other well-known writers on the subject has his merits, and will not soon be superseded; but in Dr. Bruce's volume there is a vigour and sympathy in the treatment, a power of cutting down to the very heart of the subject, a breadth and clearness of view which give it quite exceptional value, and constitute it a book of first-rate importance. The remaining portions of his New Testament Theology will be eagerly expected. [Misprints on pp. 33, 35, 239, 341, should not be allowed to re-appear in a second edition.]

Prof. Jules Bovon has completed his *Théologie du Nouveau Testament* by issuing a second volume, which comprises the teaching of the Apostles (Paris, Fischbacher). The character of the first volume is thoroughly upheld in the second, and the whole forms a contribution to New Testament theology of substantial value. The treatment is independent and fresh, and if some of the opinions expressed must be rejected, there is much which will be gratefully accepted as permanent increase to Biblical knowledge.

MISCELLANEOUS—In *Personality Human and Divine*, being the Bampton Lectures for the year 1894, by J. R. Illingworth, M.A. (Macmillan & Co.), we have one of the most attractive and important books of our time. The Lecturer aims at a re-statement of the argument from human to divine personality. In carrying out this aim, he gives us a history of the development of the conception of human personality, and an analysis of that conception, and from this passes to a similar treatment of divine personality. He then proceeds to answer the important question, "Why is God not universally known?" If God is personal, why is He not universally revealed? To answer this question, an examination of the conditions of revelation and of the

revelation actually made is necessary; and this involves a fairly full treatment of religion among savage and non-Christian peoples. The Lectures close with a powerful argument for the Incarnation as the adequate and final revelation of the Personality of God. It is difficult to convey an adequate impression of the freshness and strength of the whole argument. It is conducted with a regard to current scientific and philosophical ideas, and the whole problem of personality, as well as of the relation of the human to the divine personality, has never received so thorough, philosophical, and convincing a treatment. The conclusiveness of the argument may be variously estimated; but no unbiassed critic will deny that Mr. Illingworth has set the Personality of God in new lights, and has largely contributed to a final determination of the many problems surrounding his great theme. Even points which have again and again been handled in books on Theism are here dealt with in an original and incisive manner; and throughout the whole discussion the deepest interest is maintained by the constant occurrence of remarks full of penetration and of suggestion. It is a book which no one can be satisfied with reading once; it is to be studied. And if frequent study of it should result in the modification of some of its statements, there will inevitably grow in the mind a sense of indebtedness for many valuable thoughts, and a deepening admiration of the rare philosophical training, the full theological equipment, and the singular grace and strength of treatment recognisable throughout the volume.

From the Wesleyan Methodist Book Room is issued the twenty-fourth Fernley Lecture. Prof. Findlay was the lecturer, and chose as his theme *Christian Doctrine and Morals viewed in their connexion*. The idea of the book is good, and the method of treatment simple. The lecturer briefly unfolds the significance of the central doctrines of Christianity, the Divine Fatherhood, the Incarnation of the Son, the Indwelling of the Spirit, Sin and Atonement, Resurrection, Judgment, and Life Eternal: and each exposition of doctrine is accompanied by a statement of its bearing on morals. Prof. Findlay has done his work with care and thoroughness. There is much to be learned from it and no one interested in Christian ethics should omit its perusal. It is most gratifying to find a well-printed and really handsome octavo offered to the public for two-shillings. If the publication is not subsidized, it gives a much needed example to publishers. But why does so sound

a scholar as Prof. Findlay propagate Westcott's mistake on p. 47?

To the Wesleyan "Books for Bible Students" (Charles H. Kelly), an excellent addition has been made by Dr. Robert A. Watson. The subject is *The Apostolic Age*, and it is well-fitted to be used as a text-book. From Germany we have in recent years received a number of works on this subject, for the most part too bulky to be used by any but professional students. Dr. Watson writes with marked independence although with ample knowledge. He has wisely confined himself to the exposition of the development of doctrine and of the Church, without attempting a history of events. So independent and suggestive of fresh views is Dr. Watson that some of his statements will certainly be called in question. But every reader will be thankful for so vigorous, fresh, and candid a treatment of the most important period of the life of Church and doctrine.

In *Studies in the History of Christian Apologetics—New Testament and Post-Apostolic* (Messrs. T. & T. Clark), Dr. James Macgregor, of Oamaru completes his plea for the Christian Religion. It is a healthy and vigorous—perhaps superabundantly vigorous—treatise. Dr. Macgregor thinks poorly of gladiators as fighting men in serious warfare, but he constantly appears to his reader as a gladiator, ready with his weapons, a trained and skilled fighter, delighting in the game, and a shade ruthless in antagonism. Neither Baur nor Strauss gets quite fair treatment at his hands, and Prof. Huxley is even misrepresented. Dr. Macgregor does not seem to have seen the very strong statement of Prof. Huxley against the impossibility of miracle. Neither can all Dr. Macgregor's reasoning be accepted as decisive. At the same time the treatment of New Testament Apologetics is novel and suggestive, and the volume abounds in striking passages and clever points.

Life and Letters of Erasmus. Lectures delivered at Oxford, 1893-4 by J. A. Froude, Regius Professor of Modern History (Longmans, Green & Co.).

Prof. Froude has made many notable contributions to English literature, but he has written nothing which will give greater pleasure or, it may be said, convey weightier instruction than the present volume. The idea of the book is to let Erasmus speak for himself. He left behind him an enormous mass of correspondence,

which fills two folios. This has been sifted, arranged and translated by the indefatigable industry and skill of Prof. Froude. Instead of having to attack the unwieldy and discouraging collection of letters written in Latin and scarcely edited at all, we can now turn to this volume, in which we have in a quite brilliant rendering as much of the correspondence as has significance. It is an inestimable boon. For, measuring Erasmus' correspondence with that of many great letter-writers, such as Augustine or Jerome, we should say that none so vividly reflects the times in which the writer lived or gives such graphic portraits of the contemporary great men. But this volume is not a mere translation of well-chosen passages from Erasmus; Prof. Froude by a well-considered stream of narrative keeps us in touch with the progress of events and lends significance to each quotation. The result is a volume in which we are conveyed to historical knowledge in the most easy of vehicles. A volume which brings us more effectually into touch with a past period of history, or which gives greater intellectual enjoyment it would be hard to name.

SERMONS.—Among Sermons the first place must be given to *Christian Doctrine*, a Series of Discourses by R. W. Dale, LL.D., Birmingham (Hodder and Stoughton). In an interesting Preface Dr. Dale explains the origin of these Discourses. He takes us from the publicity of the pulpit into the privacy of the study, and discloses to us a little of his method. Sometimes, he says, he has drawn up in December or January a list of some of the subjects, ethical or doctrinal, on which he resolved to preach during the subsequent twelve months. During last year he expounded the principal doctrines of the Christian Faith, and these expositions he now publishes. The subjects treated are "The Existence of God," "The Humanity of our Lord," "The Divinity of our Lord," "The Holy Spirit," "The Trinity," "Man," "Sin," "The Atonement." The result is a book of unusual excellence and utility. No man knows better than Dr. Dale what our contemporaries are thinking about, and what difficulties hinder them from accepting the beliefs of the Church. And no man is better able to remove these difficulties. In these discourses Christian doctrine is presented with extraordinary force and persuasiveness. But perhaps the chief influence which this publication will have will consist in the impression which is inevitably made by the spectacle

of a man of Dr. Dale's mental calibre and wide knowledge standing firmly in the old paths. His three chapters on the atonement will bring light to enquirers. The least satisfactory element in his theory is his resistance to the idea of automatic penalty. It seems to us that this resistance introduces some inconsistency into his exposition. In his treatment of the Divinity of our Lord, Dr. Dale omits to consider two ideas which trouble many minds at present in relation to this subject: the immanence of God, and the Messiahship of Jesus. Few departments in theology need more attention just now than the adjustment of relations between the Messiahship and the Divinity of our Lord. Must not many passages which have been thought to carry proof of His Divinity be referred to His Messiahship? The development from belief in His Messiahship to belief in His Divinity needs to be more carefully traced than as yet has been done. The prevalent idea, too, of the immanence of God has a bearing on the personal Divinity of our Lord which has not yet been estimated with distinctness. Dr. Dale's volume will be widely read and cannot fail to do great good. Perhaps no class will derive more benefit from it than preachers. And wherever it is read, there will be awakened not only a feeling of gratitude for the earnest and substantial thinking which is here made public property, but a devout hope that so forcible and Christian a teacher may long have a voice in the guidance of the Churches.

Other volumes of sermons which can only be mentioned, although deserving longer notice, are three additions to Isbister & Co's. "Gospel and the Age Series." Of these one is by the Editor of this Magazine, Dr. Robertson Nicoll, and is entitled *Ten Minute Sermons*. They abound in passages of rare beauty, and overflow with devout thought. Another is Dean Spence's *Voices and Silences*; in several of these the preacher warmly advocates views of Scripture which have recently been somewhat in disrepute. A third is *Labour and Sorrow*, by W. J. Knox Little, M.A., Canon of Worcester. Needless to say these are eloquent; they are also well thought out, and throw light on the manner in which Christianity permeates all human life.

To the "Life Indeed" Series, published by Mr. Charles H. Kelly, Mr. R. Waddy Moss contributes *The Discipline of the Soul, Some of its Aims and Methods*. It is a volume which yields more to a second reading than to a first. There is some stiff and honest

thinking in the book, and if it does not tell us much about the methods of soul-discipline, it certainly turns our attention strongly to its underlying principles.—*The Church of the People* (Elliot Stock) contains a selection from a course of sermons on the Church of England's duty to the people of England, preached at All Saints' Church, Notting Hill. They are very unequal, the first being the worst in the volume. Some are written by experts, and are of great value; and the collection is of interest as a practical evidence of the number of points at which the Church of England is in contact with the needs of the people.—*In His Steps* is the appropriate title given by Dr. J. R. Miller to a small volume of counsels to young Christians setting out to follow Christ. It is simple, forcible, wise, practical. Happily it is now needless to recommend Dr. Miller's books. This one is published by Messrs. Anderson, Oliphant & Ferrier.—Were I asked to name the volume of sermons recently published which is most *alive*, and in which the preacher most directly and effectively addresses his hearers, I should be disposed to name *First Things First*, Addresses to young men, by the Rev. George Jackson, B.A. (Hodder and Stoughton). There is not a word of padding or commonplace in them; not a word that does not tell. To such addresses it is impossible not to listen, and impossible not to assent.—Mr. Dawson's *Making of Manhood*, issued by the same publishers, is a book of similar directness, and exhibiting a like knowledge of young men, and skill in removing their difficulties and building up character.

Under the judicious editorship of Professor Salmond the *Critical Review* has rapidly risen to the foremost place. There is no periodical which keeps one so thoroughly abreast of philosophical and theological literature. The enumeration of articles on various topics is a feature of the *Review* which cannot fail to be highly appreciated, while the estimates by specialists of current publications bear evidence of competence and fairness.—*The New World*, published in Boston, although perhaps quite too liberal, is a magazine which cannot be overlooked. The June number contains some highly interesting Biblical articles, and one by Holtzmann. The notices of books are also carefully written.—*The Classical Review* for November (David Nutt), among several interesting articles, has one on Robinson's *Philocalia* of Origen, and another

on Anrich's thorough book on the relation of Christianity to the Ancient Mysteries.

We have received *Presbyterian Forms of Service* issued by the Devotional Service Association in connection with the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland (Macniven & Wallace). They are not intended to be used liturgically, "but are offered merely as illustrations of the manner in which the various services may be appropriately conducted under the existing system of public worship in the United Presbyterian Church." Also, *Public Prayers*, by a Congregational minister (Elliot Stock), some of which are excellent.

To the Expositor's Bible have been added *The Book of Numbers*, by Robert Watson, D.D., a difficult task skilfully accomplished; and the third and completing volume of Dr. Alexander Maclaren's valuable exposition of *The Book of Psalms*, which for English readers may be said to be the best commentary on the Psalter. Students of the Psalter should also avail themselves, especially if they be preachers, of Mr. Saunders Dyer's most interesting collection of illustrations of the use of the Psalms from biography and history. He calls the volume *Psalms-Mosaics*, and it is published by Elliot Stock. The new and revised edition of the late Professor Robertson Smith's *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites*, issued by Messrs. Adam & Charles Black, will receive extended notice in a future number.

Mr. David Nutt has published *The Divine Liturgies of the Fathers among the Saints, John Chrysostom and Basil the Great, with that of the Presanctified, preceded by the Hesperinos and the Orthros*, edited, with the Greek text, by J. N. W. B. Robertson. This is an enlarged edition of the liturgies issued some years ago by the same editor. As historical documents these liturgies are well worth publishing: and even as aids to devotion they are not wholly without value. The Greek text is given on one page, an English translation on the page opposite. Mr. Nutt has given them every advantage of clear and legible type, and the general appearance of the book is attractive. The Greek type is especially good. The printing has been done in Leipzig, and besides the errata indicated in the list, a number of misprints occur not only in the English but even in the Greek, e.g., on pages 50 and 52.

The Natural History of the Christian Religion, by William Mackintosh, D.D. (Messrs. James Maclehose & Sons), is an extremely able attempt to eliminate the supernatural from Christianity. Several attempts of the kind have been made, but he who reads Dr. Mackintosh's volume reads all, for nothing so specious and in some respects so powerful has previously appeared. Candour and fairness of mind are generally discernible in the reasoning, and while it is to be hoped that the conclusions arrived at will not find acceptance, there is much in the argument which calls for consideration. Certainly it has been carefully considered and the style is commendably lucid and strong.

Prof. Geden, of Richmond Wesleyan College, has published (Chas. H. Kelly) *Exercises for Translation into Hebrew*, to accompany the Hebrew Grammar of Gesenius-Kautzsch. These will be found useful to the learner.—Messrs. Asher and Co. publish for Mr. Arthur Hall *Some Affinities of the Hebrew Language* in which he fancies that he proves the common origin of Hebrew and Greek.

Of periodicals we have received the June number of the *New World* (Gay & Bird) in which there are several articles worthy of attention: Holtzmann on Baur's New Testament Criticism; Frank Porter on the Religious and Historical uses of the Bible, and Orello Cone on the Pauline Teaching of the Person of Christ.—In the *Classical Review* for June Dr. Edwin Abbott writes on St. John's method of reckoning the hours of the day, and Mr. Percy Gardner replies to the Review of his *Origin of the Lord's Supper*. The *Anglican Church Magazine* for the same month is also to hand.

The theological literature of France has received some important additions. Prof. Bovon completes his *Théologie du Nouveau Testament* by publishing its second volume, containing *L'enseignement des Apôtres* (Lausanne, Georges Bridel et Cie.). As already said in these pages, this is a book of first-rate quality. The second volume more than fulfils the promise of the first.—Prof. Henri Bois of Montauban publishes a critical essay on the recent discussion between Sabatier and Godet, in which so many French theologians have become embroiled. This essay is entitled *De la Connaissance Religieuse*, and is published by Fischbacher, of Paris. Prof. Bois' treatment of Revelation, Authority, the Genesis of Religious Experience, and cognate subjects is well worthy of attention.—Prof. Ménégoz, of Paris, issues an important work

on *La Théologie de l'Épître aux Hébreux*, a very complete and thorough study, which, although its methods are bold, and its conclusions sometimes unacceptable, must not be overlooked by any student of Biblical Theology.

MARCUS DODS.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Rev. W. C. Allen, M.A.	
On the Meaning of <i>προσήλυτος</i> in the Septuagint	264
Peter Bayne, LL.D.	
The Secret of Jesus	179
Rev. Professor Joseph Agar Beet, D.D.	
New Testament Teaching on the Second Coming of Christ :	
2. The Teaching of St. Paul	98
3. The Synoptist Gospels	190
4. The Johannine Writings	287
5. Millenarianism	343
6. Its Spiritual Significance	439
Rev. Professor A. B. Bruce, D.D.	
St. Paul's Conception of Christianity :	
18. Christ	32
19. The Christian Life	112
20. The Church	199
21. The Last Things	300
Rev. Professor T. K. Cheyne, D.D.	
Professor Lindsay's Article on Professor W. Robertson Smith's Doctrine of Scripture	370
F. C. Conybeare, M.A.	
The Authorship of the Last Verses of Mark	219
Rev. John A. Cross, M.A.	
The Akhmîm Fragment and the Fourth Gospel	320
Rev. T. Herbert Darlow, M.A.	
Thoughts on Texts :	
1. Angels Unawares	71
2. The Joy Set Before Him	75

	PAGE
Sir J. W. Dawson, C.M.G., F.R.S.	
Physical and Historical Probabilities respecting the Authorship and Authority of the Mosaic Books:	
6. The Exodus	161
Rev. James Denney, D.D.	
The Sadducees and Immortality	401
Rev. Professor Marcus Dods, D.D.	
The Righteousness of Christ's Kingdom:	
4. Ceremonial	20
Survey of Recent Biblical Literature	78
" " " "	232
" " " "	461
Venerable F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S.	
Notes on the Reign of Joash	81
Rev. E. H. Gifford, D.D.	
The Churches of Galatia: Notes on a Recent Controversy	1
G. Buchanan Gray, M.A.	
Isaiah's Anticipations of the Future: Some Recent Theories	330
Rev. Professor Andrew Harper, B.D.	
Archæology and Criticism	372
Benjamin Kidd.	
Professor Drummond's "Ascent of Man"	57
Rev. Professor Thomas M. Lindsay, D.D.	
Professor W. Robertson Smith's Doctrines of Scripture	241
Rev. Professor J. Rawson Lumby, D.D.	
"Both Lord and Christ"	321
Prof. Eberhard Nestle, Ph.D.	
How does the Gospel of Mark Begin?	458
Rev. Professor A. Roberts, D.D.	
"Power on the Head"	139
Rev. P. Carnegie Simpson, M.A.	
The Realist among the Disciples	429

	PAGE
Rev. Professor George Adam Smith, D.D.	
Recent German Literature on the Old Testament :	
1. Budde's Translation of Kuenen's Essays	150
2. Benzinger's "Hebräische Archäologie"	153
Rev. James Stalker, D.D.	
Names for Sin	214
A Century of German Theology	313
Rev. John Watson, M.A.	
Love the Law of Spiritual Gravitation	46
Devotion to a Person the Dynamic of Religion	126
Judgment according to Type	275
Optimism the Attitude of Faith	357
Rev. Prebendary Whitefoord, M.A.	
The Leading Scriptural Metaphor—the Way	450
Professor A. S. Wilkins, LL.D.	
The Western Text of the Greek Testament	386
" " " "	409

INDEX TO TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis vi. 2	148	Matthew xxiii. 8	130
xxiii. 6, 11, 15	323	xxiv. 3	99
Exodus xvi. 34	87	xxv. 31	344
xxiv. 7	87	xxv. 40	138
xxv. 16	87	xxvi. 39	134
Deuteronomy xxxi. 9	87	xxvii. 9	249
2 Samuel i. 10	88	xxviii. 20	137
2 Kings xxii. 8	87	Mark i. 5.	7
Isaiah i.	330	ii. 18.	29
xiv. 24	330	ii. 27.	24
Matthew ix. 9	129	iv. 26	117
ix. 14	29	vii. 11	51
x. 18	136	viii. 34	131
x. 40	51	x. 29	131
xiii. 30	191	xii. 30	48
xvi. 27	191	xii. 34	48
xvii. 24-27	21	Luke v. 8	133
xxii. 36	47	v. 33	29
xxiii. 2	21	vi. 47	129

	PAGE		PAGE
Mark ix. 26	131	1 Corinthians xv. 25	324
ix. 21	50	xv. 27	46
xvii. 22	193	xv. 28	45
John iii. 36	108	xv. 45	39
v. 25	287	xv. 50	200
viii. 48	362	xv. 51	106
x. 7	129	xv. 51	303
x. 11	134	xvi. 17	99
x. 17	52	2 Corinthians i. 1	204
xi. 16	135	iii. 12	211
xii. 32	134	iv. 14	107
xiii. 14	133	v. 1	303
xiii. 34	50	Galatians iii. 29	36
xiv. 6	129	iv. 4	36
xiv. 23	52	iv. 14	2
xv. 12	48	v. 22	125
xv. 13	134	v. 23	115
xvi. 12	121	Ephesians ii. 5	297
Acts i. 8	9	ii. 6	349
iii. 19-21	198	iv. 11	119
iv. 14	395	Philippians i. 23	302
viii. 16	249	ii. 7-8	36
xiii. 14	1	ii. 12	119
xiv. 24	1	Colossians i. 15	39
xvi. 23	17	1 Thessalonians ii. 19	99
xvii. 3	110	iv. 13	304
xxiii. 35	17	iv. 16	99
xxv. 13	17	v. 1	110
Romans ii. 5	107	2 Thessalonians i. 10	19
vi. 4-6	114	i. 10	109
viii. 3	41	ii. 3	353
viii. 3	36	ii. 8	291
viii. 11	105	ii. 9	296
viii. 22	39	1 Timothy i. 14	109
xiii. 11	105	2 Timothy i. 12	190
xiv. 17	201	iii. 16	250
1 Corinthians i. 7	104	Titus ii. 13	109
ii. 11	248	Hebrews xii. 2	75
vi. 9	200	xiii. 2	71
viii. 6	40	Revelation i. 7	292
xi. 10	139	vi. 1-8	292
xiii. 2	124	xx. 9	347
xv. 23	346	xx. 11-15	296

